LIBRARY OF NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES

JESUS' EXPOSITION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN LUKE'S GOSPEL

CHARLES A. KIMBALL

t&t clark

JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT
SUPPLEMENT SERIES
94

Executive Editor
Stanley E. Porter

Editorial Board
Richard Bauckham, David Catchpole, R. Alan Culpepper,
Joanna Dewey, James D.G. Dunn, Craig A. Evans, Robert Fowler,
Robert Jewett, Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, Dan O. Via

JSOT Press
Sheffield

Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel

Charles A. Kimball

Journal for the Study of the New Testament
Supplement Series 94

To Connie
Beloved Wife
True Helpmate
Dearest Friend

Copyright © 1994 Sheffield Academic Press

Published by JSOT Press
JSOT Press is an imprint of
Sheffield Academic Press Ltd
343 Fulwood Road
Sheffield S10 3BP
England

Typeset by Sheffield Academic Press

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available
from the British Library

EISBN 9781850754640

CONTENTS

Preface 7
Abbreviations 9
Introduction 11

Chapter 1
THE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN LUKE'S GOSPEL 13
The Previous Studies 14
The Present Study 30
The Pre-resurrection Origin of the Old Testament Expositions Ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels 31
Conclusion 43

Chapter 2
THE EXEGETICAL MILIEU OF LUKE'S GOSPEL 45
Quotations and Allusions 46
Introductory Formulas 49
Other Exegetical Terminology 55
Hillel's Exegetical Rules 56
Midrashic Interpretation 60
Literal Interpretation 76

Chapter 3
THE EXPOSITION OF OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS BY JESUS IN LUKE 1–19 79
The Temptation (4.1-13) 80
The Nazareth Sermon (4.16-30) 97
The Discussion with the Lawyer (10.25-37) 119
The Discussion with the Rich Ruler (18.18-30) 135

Chapter 4
THE EXPOSITION OF OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS
BY JESUS IN LUKE 20–24 147
The Exposition of Isaiah 5 (20.9-19) 147
The Exposition on the Resurrection (20.27-40) 164
The Exposition on the Messiah as David's Lord (20.41-44) 177
The Saying on the Coming of the Son of Man
in the Eschatological Discourse (21.25-28) 187

Chapter 5
CONCLUSIONS 197
The Text Form of the Quotations 198
The Use of Exegetical Methods 199
The Use and Exposition of Scripture 200
The Influence on the Early Church 201
The Unity and Historicity of Jesus' Expositions 202

Appendix A
OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN LUKE 204
Appendix B
OLD TESTAMENT ALLUSIONS IN LUKE 206
Appendix C
INTRODUCTORY FORMULAS PRECEDING OLD TESTAMENT
QUOTATIONS IN LUKE 213
Appendix D
INTRODUCTORY FORMULAS AND TERMS FOR SCRIPTURE
APPEARING WITHOUT OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN LUKE 214
Appendix E
NON-EXPOSITORY QUOTATIONS BY JESUS IN LUKE 215

Selected Bibliography 216
Index of Biblical References 240
Index of Authors 249

PREFACE

This work is the product of a long-held desire to work in what has been for me the most intriguing area of biblical studies, the NT use of the OT. It represents a revision of my 1991 PhD dissertation completed under E. Earle Ellis at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Texas. The present form contains an updated bibliography and a revision of the entire work (esp. Chapters 3 and 4). This revision has allowed me to express my most recent thoughts on Jesus' exposition of the OT in Luke's Gospel while also making certain additions needed to make it available to a wider academic arena.

I am most grateful to the publisher, JSOT Press, and Stanley E. Porter, Executive Editor of the JSNT Supplement Series, for the opportunity to bring the work up to date and to make it available to a wider audience.

Several people merit my heartfelt appreciation in helping bring this work to completion. First, my wife Connie to whom this book is dedicated is truly a helpmate worthy of the description of Prov. 31.10-31; she has been a continual source of support in all areas of my life, studies and ministry. She is to be commended for her willingness to be the wife of a student for the first eight years of our marriage, to earn most of our income during these years, and to put off childbearing until my education was completed. Also, my parents, Sandra A. Kimball and Charles A. Kimball, Jr, have provided help in numerous ways during my educational process.

A number of people have helped bring this work to fruition although only a few will be mentioned. My colleague James Wiles has on several occasions provided gracious assistance on word processing needs. My friends Warren and Oleane Johnson opened their home to my family and me and loaned their car to me while I was in Fort Worth completing the research for the revised manuscript.

Finally, E. Earle Ellis, the supervisor of my dissertation, provided

expert guidance throughout the various phases of the dissertation and a thorough critique of each chapter. He furnished helpful advice in producing the revision, and he encouraged me all along to write with a view towards publication.

Quotations of biblical texts are from K. Aland *et al.* (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 26th edn, 1979); A. Rahlfs (ed.), *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979); and K. Elliger *et al.* (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2nd edn, 1983). All translations are my own unless otherwise indicated.

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ALUOS	Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society
ATR	*Anglican Theological Review*
AUSS	*Andrews University Seminary Studies*
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
Bib	*Biblica*
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*
BR	*Biblical Research*
BSO(A)S	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies*
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CQR	*Church Quarterly Review*
CTM	*Concordia Theological Monthly*
DBSup	*Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément*
EstBíb	*Estudios bíblicos*
EvQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
EvT	*Evangelische Theologie*
ExpTim	*Expository Times*
GTJ	*Grace Theological Journal*
HeyJ	*Heythrop Journal*
HibJ	*Hibbert Journal*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IBS	*Irish Biblical Studies*
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
Int	*Interpretation*
ISBE	G.W. Bromiley (ed.), *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, rev. edn
JANESCU	*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JewEnc	*The Jewish Encyclopedia*
JES	*Journal of Ecumenical Studies*

JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
NCB	New Century Bible
NEB	New English Bible
Neot	*Neotestamentica*
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	The New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OTL	Old Testament Library
RB	*Revue biblique*
RevExp	*Review and Expositor*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumran*
RevScRel	*Revue des sciences religieuses*
RSR	*Recherches de science religieuse*
RTR	*Reformed Theological Review*
SE	*Studia Evangelica*
SEÅ	*Svensk exegetisk årsbok*
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
ST	*Studia theologica*
Str-B	[H. Strack and] P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*
TD	*Theology Digest*
TDNT	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
TS	*Theological Studies*
TTod	*Theology Today*
TynBul	*Tyndale Bulletin*
TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WTJ	*Westminster Theological Journal*
ZAW	*Zeischrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

INTRODUCTION

Along with a number of passages in common with Matthew and Mark, Luke preserves several unique traditions of Jesus' use of the OT at key times during his life and ministry which show that Jesus spent his life expounding the Scriptures as the basis for his teachings and for his ministry as a whole.[1] For example, Luke alone provides the accounts of Jesus' first sermon (4.16-30) and last words on the cross (23.46), which are based on OT citations.[2] And only Luke presents the narratives of the twelve-year-old Jesus discussing the OT with the Jewish teachers in the temple (2.41-48) and of the resurrected Jesus explaining the OT to his disciples on the road to Emmaus (24.13-49). That Jesus saw his OT expositions to be primary for his ministry and that Luke found Jesus' use of the OT to be vital for his portrayal of Jesus are apparent both from his preservation of these unique traditions and from his inclusion of others paralleled in Matthew and Mark.

Although the use of the OT in Luke and the use of the exegetical methods of first-century Judaism in various NT books have been subjects of extensive study since the 1950s,[3] no major work has considered Jesus' OT expositions in Luke in the light of these methods. Therefore, the present study will inquire into Jesus' exposition of explicit OT quotations in Luke's Gospel in the light of the exegetical methods of first-century Judaism via an inductive exegetical analysis. Chapter 1 presents a history of research of the OT in Luke's Gospel, gives a brief proposal for the present study, and

1. Besides numerous passages in which Jesus employed OT allusions, language or references, in Luke there are eight pericopes in which Jesus expounds explicit OT quotations (see n. 4) and eight passages in which he cites explicit, nonexpository OT quotations (see ch. 3, n. 1).

2. There are two additional explicit OT quotations given by Jesus that are unique to Luke: Isa. 53.12 in Lk. 22.37; and Hos. 10.8 in Lk. 23.30.

3. The pertinent studies on these issues are cited or discussed in Chapters 1 and 2.

discusses the pre-resurrection origin of the OT expositions ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels. Chapter 2 examines the exegetical milieu of Luke's Gospel by considering the exegetical methodology of first-century Judaism. Chapters 3 and 4 analyze the eight pericopes in Luke's Gospel in which Jesus expounds explicit OT quotations.[4]

4. The Lukan expository episodes and the explicit OT quotations contained in them are as follows: Lk. 4.1-13 (Deut. 8.3; 6.13, 16; Ps. 91.11-12); Lk. 4.16-30 (Isa. 61.1-2; 58.6); Lk. 10.25-37 (Deut. 6.5; Lev. 19.18); Lk. 18.18-30 (Exod. 20.12-16/Deut. 5.16-20); Lk. 20.9-19 (Ps. 118.22); Lk. 20.27-40 (Deut. 25.5; Gen. 38.8; Exod. 3.6); Lk. 20.41-44 (Ps. 110.1); Lk. 21.25-28 (Dan. 7.13).

Chapter 1

THE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN LUKE'S GOSPEL

The study of the NT use of the OT has been an area of concern to Bible scholars since the patristic church although the first systematic treatments of this subject area did not begin until after the Reformation.[1] The examination of OT quotations and allusions in specific NT books has been largely a twentieth-century phenomenon,

1. I will not look at the study of NT use of the OT as a whole, which is outside the scope of this work, but only give a representative chronological listing of the major books in the field. Sixteenth century: J. Drusius, *Parallela sacra* (Franecker, 1594). Seventeenth century: L. Cappel, *Critica sacra* (Paris: Cramoisy, 1650). Eighteenth century: W. Surenhusius, ספר המשׁוה *sive* βίβλος καταλλαγῆς (Amsterdam: Boom, 1713); T. Randolph, *The Prophecies and Other Texts Cited in the New Testament* (Oxford: Fletcher, 1782); H. Owen, *The Modes of Quotation Used by the Evangelical Writers* (London: Nichols, 1789). Nineteenth Century: D. Turpie, *The Old Testament in the New* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1868); E. Haupt, *Die alttestamentlichen Citate in den vier Evangelien erörtert* (Colberg: Jancke, 1871); C.H. Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884); F. Johnson, *The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1896). H.B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2nd edn, 1900). Twentieth century: W. Dittmar, *Vetus Testamentum in Novo* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903); C.H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet, 1952); J.W. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954); R.N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975); G.L. Archer and G. Chirichigno, *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament* (Chicago: Moody, 1983); E.E. Ellis, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1990). For a recent chronological examination of the history of this study with a comprehensive summary of the major works, see Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 53-74, which is a revision of *idem*, 'Quotations in the New Testament', *ISBE*, IV, pp. 18-25. See also nn. 2-4 for works on specific Gospels and n. 48 for studies devoted to Jesus' use of the OT.

and the investigation of the employment of the OT in Luke[2] and the other Gospels[3] remained relatively untouched until the 1950s.[4] This chapter will present a history of research of previous studies on the OT in the Gospel of Luke, will give a brief proposal for the present study, and will address the issue of the pre-resurrection origin of the OT expositions ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels.

The Previous Studies

A few books and a number of articles have been devoted to various aspects of the OT in Luke–Acts.[5] This survey will deal with significant works on the OT in Luke or Luke–Acts. It will focus on the Gospel rather than Acts and will consider six areas of current concern: (1) the text form of OT citations, (2) midrash as narrative invention, (3) midrash as commentary technique and pattern, (4) the proof from

2. The three comprehensive books are T. Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas* (Berlin: Akadamie Verlag, 1968); M. Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1969); and D.L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987). Works on specific Lukan issues are discussed below.

3. E.g., K. Stendahl, *The School of St Matthew* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968); R.H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 1967); A. Suhl, *Der Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965); E.D. Freed, *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John* (Leiden: Brill, 1965); and G. Reim, *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974). For a general overview of the use of the OT in each of the four Gospels and for a listing of additional works, see C.A. Evans, 'Old Testament in the Gospels', in J.B. Green, S. McKnight and I.H. Marshall (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1992), pp. 579-90.

4. W.J. Larkin, Jr, 'Luke's Use of the Old Testament in Luke 22–23' (PhD dissertation, University of Durham, 1974), pp. 5-104, surveys the history of the study of the NT use of the OT from 1500–1972 and credits the redaction-critical studies that arose in the 1950s with giving the impetus for works on the OT in Luke as they considered Luke's theology and its OT background.

5. Recently, two histories of research on the OT in Luke–Acts have been completed: F. Bovon, *Luke the Theologian* (trans. K. McKinney; Allison Park: Pickwick, 1987), pp. 78-108, looks at the literature from 1950–76; and Bock, *Proclamation*, pp. 13-46, surveys works from 1922–84. The present chapter will update these studies, will present a more comprehensive overview of studies on the OT in Luke, but will largely exclude those limited to the OT in Acts.

prophecy motif, (5) OT Christology, and (6) dissertations on specific Lukan texts.[6]

The Text Form of Quotations

Numerous works that deal with the text form of OT quotations in the entire NT have appeared since the sixteenth century as scholars have wrestled with the differences between NT quotations and their OT sources (i.e., the MT and LXX).[7] However, more indepth, text-form analyses that are devoted specifically to Luke or to one of the other Gospels have been done only in our century. The monograph by T. Holtz and the articles by H. Ringgren and by C.K. Barrett have addressed this issue in Luke–Acts.

The major work on the text form of all the explicit quotations in Luke–Acts is T. Holtz's *Habilitationsschrift*.[8] The book is divided into three parts: (1) the *selbständigen* quotations, that is, those books Luke knows personally (the Minor Prophets, Isaiah and Psalms), (2) Pentateuchal citations, and (3) quotations of diverse origin. Holtz's book has two aims: to determine the books Luke knew personally (*selbständigen*) and to study the text form of the citations. After analyzing each quotation, it offers the following conclusions: (1) Luke knew only the LXX, in a form close to our LXX^A, and his non-LXX quotations are traditional rather than redactional creations.

6. The works generally are treated chronologically within the topical framework. One essay that does not fit the topical treatment is V.T. Kirby, 'Did S. Luke Know the Old Testament?', *ExpTim* 33 (1921–22), pp. 227-29, which contends that as a Gentile Christian Luke had little knowledge and interest in the OT. But on the likelihood that Luke was a Jew rather than a Gentile, see the works cited in Chapter 2, n. 1.

7. See, e.g., the works cited in nn. 1-3 and in Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 53-74, many of which analyze the text form of citations.

8. Holtz, *Zitate bei Lukas*, basically confirmed an earlier study limited to Acts by W.K.L. Clarke, 'The Use of the Septuagint in Acts', in F.J.F. Jackson and K. Lake (eds.), *The Beginnings of Christianity, Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1922), II, pp. 66-105. For studies limited to the text form of citations in Acts, see, e.g., L. Cerfaux, 'Citations scripturaires et tradition textuelle dans le Livre des Acts', in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne* (Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950), pp. 43-53; E. Haenchen, 'Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte', *ZTK* 51 (1954), pp. 153-67; and M. Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), pp. 20-55. Several other works which are listed below also do text-form analyses on selected texts while emphasizing other areas of concern.

He clearly knows the LXX textual tradition of the Minor Prophets and Isaiah although he is less consistent with the Psalms due to their liturgical usage. (2) The Evangelist had a copy of the texts of the Minor Prophets, Isaiah, and Psalms, which were his preferred books and from which he verified and corrected traditional quotations. (3) Luke followed his text faithfully and with few deviations or theological alterations. (4) Since Luke's citations from the Pentateuch are rare and usually differ from the LXX, he did not possess a copy of the Pentateuch, did not know it, and had little interest in it. Consequently, he must have taken these from traditional testimony collections. Although a few of Holtz's conclusions have been challenged,[9] this book remains the standard work on the text form of Lukan quotations.

More recently, H. Ringgren has written a short essay on the text form of citations in Luke–Acts.[10] Based on Lk. 24.47 he concludes that Luke had an intense interest in the OT and its relation to Jesus and the apostles. On the Gospel of Luke he makes comparisons of the explicit OT quotations with the Synoptics, with the LXX, and with the MT, and he examines the OT allusions in the poems of ch. 1. He thinks that the variations from the OT in the citations unique to Luke (i.e., L material[11]) are due to Luke's faulty memory and that the quotations in the L material are closer to the LXX than when he follows Mark. Thus, Ringgren raises questions on the nature of Luke's handling of the OT in his unique sections.

In another recent, brief article C.K. Barrett provides comparisons of Luke's quotations with the OT and with parallels in the Synoptic Gospels.[12] He defines citations as only those OT quotations that appear with introductory formulas (IF) and that are quoted literally. In his comparison of each quotation with those in the Synoptics (premised by

9. E.g., Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, pp. 98-101; and Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive*, pp. 211-13, stress his minimization of alterations. Bock, *Proclamation*, pp. 14-16, objects to his assumptions on Luke's possession and usage of LXX texts and on Luke's neglect of the Pentateuch.

10. H. Ringgren, 'Luke's Use of the Old Testament', *HTR* 79 (1986), pp. 227-36.

11. L is used to designate the unique traditions in Luke's Gospel and the source(s) behind these traditions. For studies on the L material see K. Giles '"L" Tradition', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 431-32.

12. C.K. Barrett, 'Luke/Acts', in D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson (eds.), *It is Written* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 231-44. His text-form analysis focuses on comparisons to Matthew and Mark rather than to the OT.

the Synoptic source theory that Luke used Mark and Q[13]), he discusses Lukan editorial changes and the significance of his IF. Barrett concludes that Luke's contribution to the NT use of the OT is small as he only furnishes the unique citations of 4.18-19, 22.37 and the distinct summary statement of Luke 24; he also assumes that Luke created these unique pericopes due to their lack of multiple attestation.

Because of the Semitic character of certain parts of Luke's Gospel (e.g., Luke 1–2), several scholars have supposed that Luke consciously adopted Semitisms and imitated LXX style in the composition of his Gospel. All experts agree that there are Semitisms and Septuagintisms (i.e., words and phrases characteristic to the LXX) in the NT, and many assert that this is especially true of Luke–Acts.[14] Yet they disagree on the reason—such as conscious imitation by Luke, the sources Luke used, a translation from Hebrew/Aramaic into Greek, or simply the Jewish milieu of the NT—for this phenomenon. The most ardent proponent of LXX imitation, H.F.D. Sparks, claims that Luke deliberately used Septuagintisms to write in a biblical style but admits that his argument seems speculative.[15] Other authorities, however, contend

13. Q is used to designate non-Markan traditions common to Matthew and Luke or the source(s) behind these traditions. For studies on Q, see G.N. Stanton, 'Q', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 644-50.

14. J.C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2nd edn, 1968), pp. 15-23, 198-207, studies words peculiar and characteristic to each of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts in comparison to the LXX and concludes Luke is the most familiar with the LXX. Clarke, 'Use of the LXX', pp. 66-73, confirms Hawkins with further comparisons. J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke I–IX* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981), pp. 107-27, also builds on Hawkins and provides a detailed discussion on Lukan language and style with helpful tables and bibliography on Septuagintisms and Semitisms.

15. H.F.D. Sparks, 'The Semitisms in St. Luke's Gospel', *JTS* 44 (1943), pp. 129-38, claims there are five LXX influences on Luke: (1) OT quotations usually in LXX form, (2) OT names usually with LXX spelling, (3) characteristic vocabulary and (4) key phrases adopted from the LXX, and (5) Luke's changing of Mark to conform to LXX language. He extends the last point to argue (a) that Luke only used Mark and Q and had no L source for his unique material and (b) that the L material is Luke's rewriting of oral tradition and Mark with a LXX flavor. Cf. *idem*, 'The Semitisms in Acts', *JTS* 1 (1950), pp. 16-28; and *idem*, 'Some Observations on the Semitic Background of the New Testament', *Society for New Testament Studies Bulletin* 2 (1951), pp. 33-42. Similarly, e.g., L. Morris, *The Gospel according to Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), pp. 29-30; and W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2nd edn, 1961), p. 23.

that the Jewish Greek of Luke's day that he used, and that affected both his sources[16] and his Gospel, is a more persuasive explanation for this phenomenon.[17]

Midrash as Narrative Creation

Several writers, most notably J. Drury and M.D. Goulder, who build on an intriguing essay by C.F. Evans, use the term midrash to describe a method allegedly employed by Luke for a fictional creation of NT narratives from OT stories. While Evans does not mention the term midrash, Goulder and Drury have extended his thesis and system of LXX parallels to all of Luke, and they use 'creative midrash' to describe Luke's method of composing his Gospel. They loosely define midrash as an imaginative literary technique with Jewish roots that biblical writers employed to create NT narratives based on previously written scriptural passages. In turn, they argue that the Evangelists embellished their Gospel traditions by inserting non-historical details from the LXX; therefore, they contend that many NT pericopes are combinations of history and fiction. For example, they think that Luke invented and elaborated much of the wording and the details of his birth narratives (Luke 1–2) by using the LXX to parallel them with famous OT stories.

C.F. Evans claims that Luke identified Jesus as the prophet like Moses and that he selected and organized the material in the central section of his Gospel (10.1–18.14), which is largely unique to him, to parallel the LXX version of Deuteronomy 1–26 and to present the

16. E.g., E.E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, rev. edn, 1974), p. 3, argues that Luke's Semitic idiom comes from his sources. Cf. Wilcox, *Semitisms*, pp. 180-84, who has the same view on Acts.

17. E.g., N. Turner, 'The Quality of the Greek of Luke–Acts', in J.K. Elliot (ed.), *Studies in New Testament Language and Text* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), pp. 387-400, minimizes the influence of sources and holds to the influence of Jewish Greek that Luke spoke and shared with the LXX. Similarly, F.L. Horton, 'Reflections on the Semitisms of Luke–Acts', in C.H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on Luke–Acts* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978), pp. 1-23, favors the influence of synagogue Greek that was used for religious purposes rather than LXX imitation. Both of the above cite M. Black, 'Second Thoughts IX', *ExpTim* 77 (1965), pp. 20-23, who notes the complexity of NT Greek, a complexity due to the translations of sayings in the Gospels, LXX influence, common Greek, and the peculiar Jewish Greek that may have been influenced by the Greek-speaking synagogue.

section as a Christian Deuteronomy.[18] Then, in parallel columns of Greek texts Evans attempts to show similarities in order and content between these portions of Deuteronomy and Luke.[19]

J. Drury was the first to make the extension from Evans's LXX parallels to the creative midrash thesis.[20] In the preface he begins by discussing his suppositions on the composition of Luke–Acts, several of which he has adopted from other scholars, that he will argue in his work. (1) He asserts that Luke's only sources were Matthew, Mark and the LXX, which was as important a source as the Gospel documents. (2) Relying on M.D. Goulder, Drury contends that Luke like other NT writers used the imaginative literary discipline of midrash and that he wrote his Gospel for a weekly lectionary.[21] (3) He builds

18. C.F. Evans, 'The Central Section of St Luke's Gospel', in D.E. Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 37-54. This essay does not advocate narrative creation, but it is treated here since others (esp. J. Drury and M.D. Goulder) have extended his thesis to argue for the presence of creative midrash in Luke. See his more recent but briefer treatment in *idem*, *Saint Luke* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990), pp. 34-37. In this work (esp. pp. 15-44) he objects to the extensions of his thesis by Drury and Goulder at four points: (1) their solution to the Synoptic problem (he holds to a Q source while they contend that there was no Q and that Luke used Matthew for his source of their common material), and their related views on (2) creative narrative midrash, (3) the Christian lectionary, and (4) the composition of narratives based on LXX-style imitation, all of which are discussed below.

19. Only a few have endorsed Evans's view: e.g., D.P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989); J.A. Sanders, 'The Ethics of Election in Luke's Great Parable Banquet', in J.L. Crenshaw and J.T. Willis (eds.), *Essays on Old Testament Ethics* (New York: Ktav, 1974), pp. 245-71; J.D.M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970), pp. 100, 129, 226; and J. Bligh, *Christian Deuteronomy (Luke 9–18)* (Langley: St Paul Publ., 1970). Those who extend it (Drury and Goulder) are discussed below. In contrast C.L. Blomberg, 'Midrash, Chiasmus, and the Outline of Luke's Central Section', in R.T. France and D. Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), III, pp. 222-28, argues against Evans (1) that the practice he alleges Luke employed is not found in other ancient literature, and (2) that most of his parallels are quite vague and exaggerated.

20. J. Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel* (London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1976). See esp. pp. xi-xii, for his presuppositions and ch. 4, 'Using Scripture', pp. 46-81, for his views on the place of the OT in Luke.

21. M.D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1974), contends (1) that Matthew's only source was Mark which he expanded through creative midrash and (2) that his arrangement was based on a lectionary book of the

on the LXX parallels in Evans's essay. In the development of these assumptions Drury offers the following conclusions: (1) Luke wrote in the climate of Jewish historiography that blended history and imagination. (2) Luke's Gospel is a midrash on Matthew, Mark and the LXX, and much of it, particularly Luke 1–2,[22] 4.16-30, 5.1-11, 7.11-17, 9.51-62, 10.29-37, 15.11-32, 16.1-8 and 19.1-10 (i.e., the L material), consists of creative alterations and additions to Matthew and Mark with the LXX as the likely source.[23] (3) As the preacher at weekly meetings, Luke combined the OT and Christian documents as the basis for a lectionary and his sermons. In response, several scholars have aptly criticized Drury for his view of midrash as narrative creation and for his lax picture of biblical tradition.[24]

Jewish-Christian year. Cf. the earlier lectionary theories of R.G. Finch, *The Synagogue Lectionary and the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 1939); P. Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Calendar* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952); and A. Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960).

22. Others have so questioned the infancy narratives. The most prominent is R.E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977), esp. pp. 32-38, 235-499, 557-63, who rejects the historicity of much of this unique material and claims that Luke could have composed all of it by using the technique of midrash which he defines as combining history and creative imagination based on OT characters. In contrast R. Laurentin, *The Truth of Christmas* (trans. M.J. Wrenn; Petersham: St Bede, 1986), esp. pp. 309-465, defends the historicity of these chapters in opposition to Brown. He explains that the midrash Luke used here was a rereading of the OT in application to the NT. He stresses that midrash is misunderstood when defined by later decadent forms or by narrative creation. For other defenses of the historicity of these narratives, see, e.g., Bock, *Proclamation*, pp. 55-90; and S. Farris, *The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985). Cf. R.T. France, 'Scripture, Tradition, and History in the Infancy Narratives of Matthew', in R.T. France and D. Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), II, pp. 239-66, on Matthew's version.

23. Drury, *Tradition and Design*, pp. 39-45, rejects standard methods of NT criticism (i.e., form, source and redaction) and espouses what he terms midrash criticism (i.e., comparing NT documents to other Jewish writings that combined history and fiction). See also *idem*, 'Midrash and Gospel', *Theology* 77 (1974), pp. 291-96.

24. B. McNeil, 'Midrash in Luke?', *HeyJ* 19 (1978), pp. 399-404, argues (1) that Drury's use of midrash as narrative creation is an improper employment of the term (midrash means biblical commentary not a fictional creation of history based on Scripture), (2) that Luke gives a strong impression of historical accuracy as opposed to Drury's comparison of Luke to second-century Christian apocrypha that lack in historicity, and (3) that Luke's unique material is traditional. C.F.D. Moule,

M.D. Goulder's work on Luke[25] has grown out of his previous book on Matthew.[26] It represents positions that are similar to Drury's although he sets out a more extreme lectionary hypothesis. Its major conclusions are as follows: (1) Luke only used Mark and Matthew, and he created his Q and L material. (2) The Evangelist developed his Gospel as lections for the weekly OT lesson and derived his outline from an OT lectionary. Goulder rightly admits the tentative nature of his conjecture—describing it as plausible, speculative, subjective, cumulative, and an imaginative argument—but he still insists that it is the solution. His opponents have harshly critiqued both the speculative nature and insufficient support of his lectionary hypothesis; even his predecessors Evans and Drury express some hesitation about his lectionary thesis. They cite the following shortcomings of his theory: his list of lectionary parallels are often too general to be convincing, and his lectionary system often fails to agree with the presupposed order or other lectionaries which makes him resort to special pleading. In addition, they reject his lax view of biblical tradition and his creative midrash hypothesis.[27]

The Birth of the New Testament (New York: Harper & Row, 3rd edn, 1982), p. 95, objects to the speculative nature of Drury and Goulder's (cited in n. 25) contentions. Cf. the criticism of the creative midrash view of Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 94-95; France and Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives*, III; R.T. France, 'Jewish Historiography, Midrash, and the Gospels', in France and Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives*, III, pp. 99-128; and P.S. Alexander, 'Midrash and the Gospels' and 'Rabbinic Biography and the Biography of Jesus', in C.M. Tuckett (ed.), *Synoptic Studies* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), pp. 1-50. For the traditional view of midrash see the sections on midrash as commentary technique and pattern in ch. 1 and on midrashic interpretation in ch. 2.

25. M.D. Goulder, *The Evangelists' Calendar* (London: SPCK, 1978). See also *idem*, *Luke* (2 vols.; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), which is a comprehensive restatement of his former book with an application to a commentary. It has the aims (1) of abolishing the hypothesis of Q and L sources and (2) of showing how Luke combined Matthew and Mark and created his unique material. This more recent work rightly forsakes using the term midrash as a designation for narrative expansion due to the critique by Alexander, 'Midrash and the Gospels', pp. 1-18. But Goulder still alleges that Luke practiced narrative creation which he formerly called embroidering midrash. Cf. M.D. Goulder, 'On Putting Q to the Test', *NTS* 24 (1978), pp. 218-34; and M.D. Goulder and M.L. Sanderson, 'St Luke's Genesis', *JTS* 8 (1957), pp. 12-30.

26. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*.

27. C.F. Evans, 'Goulder and the Gospels', *Theology* 82 (1979), pp. 425-32;

Midrash as Commentary Technique and Pattern

In contrast to those who employ the term midrash to posit the fictional creation of NT narratives, other scholars use the term according to its traditional meaning of biblical commentary based on Jewish techniques and patterns for interpreting Scripture. Although no works have been devoted to the use of midrash as commentary in Luke, a few scholars have analyzed some Lukan passages in their more comprehensive studies on the NT use of the OT. Three representatives of this approach are J.W. Doeve, R.N. Longenecker and E.E. Ellis.

J.W. Doeve pioneered the study of the use of rabbinic methods for the exegetical study of the NT.[28] After examining early rabbinic exegesis, particularly the exegetical rules of Rabbi Hillel, he applies these findings to selected passages in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. In Luke he examines 8.9-10 and 6.1-5 (and others more briefly) and finds rabbinic methods of biblical interpretation to have been used in these passages.

R.N. Longenecker takes into consideration the methods of the rabbis, Qumran sectarians and Philo (i.e., literalist, midrashic, *pesher* and allegorical methods), and then applies these findings to all the books in the NT.[29] In particular, he devotes chapters to the use of these techniques by Jesus and the Evangelists and thus briefly examines several Lukan passages where these various techniques are employed.

E.E. Ellis has written a number of articles dealing with the presence of midrash in the NT that have included an examination of some passages in Luke.[30] Besides the consideration of the elements that

and J. Drury, review of M.D. Goulder, *The Evangelist's Calendar*, *JSNT* 7 (1980), pp. 71-73. Harsher criticisms are given by L. Morris, 'The Gospels and the Jewish Lectionaries', in France and Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives*, III, pp. 129-51; Bock, *Proclamation*, pp. 23-25; Blomberg, 'Luke's Central Section', pp. 229-33; and Moule, *Birth*, p. 95.

28. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, esp. pp. 91-167.

29. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, esp. pp. 19-78, 133-40. The Jewish terms used by these scholars are defined in ch. 2's section on midrashic interpretation where additional studies are included.

30. These are conveniently grouped in two collections: F.E. Ellis, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', 'Midrash, Targum and New Testament Quotations' and 'New Directions in Form Criticism', in *Prophecy and Hermeneutic* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1978), pp. 147-72, 188-97, 237-53. Most recently, his *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 77-138, which contains revisions of his 'Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church', in M.J. Mulder (ed.), *Mikra* (Philadelphia:

Doeve and Longenecker discussed, he has also distinguished between two types of midrash: implicit midrash (i.e., interpretive renderings of the OT) and explicit midrash (i.e., text plus commentary), and found the presence of midrashic techniques and midrashic commentary patterns (i.e., *proem* and *yelammedenu*) in several NT and Lukan expositions (e.g., Lk. 6.1-5; 10.25-37; 20.9-19).

The Proof from Prophecy Motif

Most scholars see proof from prophecy (i.e., Luke used the OT to prove that Jesus was the messiah predicted by the OT prophets) as the purpose behind much of Luke's OT usage, although in recent years a few authorities have challenged this supposition as can be seen in a survey of scholars. Included among these are H.J. Cadbury, P. Schubert, H. Conzelmann, E. Franklin, N.A. Dahl, J.T. Sanders and C.H. Talbert.

H.J. Cadbury authored the seminal view of proof from OT fulfillment that has brought a near consensus to the present.[31] He characterizes this motif as follows: (1) Luke employs this feature, which is pervasive in Luke–Acts, to display God's guidance and control. (2) He uses OT fulfillments in a manner distinct from the other Gospels. For example, while Matthew stresses the details of fulfillment to emphasize the correspondence between prediction and fulfillment, Luke has a more apologetic motive to explain difficult motifs, such as the necessity of Christ's suffering. Therefore, Luke stresses a 'must' over the predictive 'shall', a necessity explained by OT prophecies and which is most evident in the general reference of Lk. 24.44-47. (3) Luke does not limit this theme to Christ's death but extends it to his resurrection and the work of the church in Acts. Moreover, (4) he develops his philosophy of history in Luke–Acts in this manner.

Building on Cadbury's thesis, P. Schubert has provided the most influential work on the subject in his essay on the structure and significance of Luke 24.[32] He offers the following argument: (1) Luke

Fortress Press, 1988), pp. 692-725; and E.E. Ellis, 'How Jesus Interpreted his Bible', *CTR* 3 (1989), pp. 341-51.

31. H.J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke–Acts* (London: SPCK, rev. edn, 1958 [1927]), pp. 303-306.

32. P. Schubert, 'The Structure and Significance of Luke 24', in W. Eltester (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1954), pp. 165-86. Cf. J. Dupont, 'Apologetic Use of the Old Testament in the Speeches of

composed ch. 24 in three parts—the pericopes dealing with the empty tomb, the Emmaus appearance and the appearance to the eleven—that climaxes with the risen Christ explaining the OT. The Evangelist shaped traditional materials for his theology of history and pulled the three sections together by the proof from prophecy motif that Jesus is the Christ. (2) In ch. 24 Luke was concerned primarily with proof from prophecy. Then, based on 24.6-8's 'remember how he told you...', Schubert looks at this theme in Luke 1–2, 4.14-32, 7.18-33, 9.18-22, 28-36, 37-43, 51 and asserts that this is the dominant theology throughout Luke–Acts. He stops his examination after 9.51 and mentions a stylistic parallel between Acts 28.17-31 and Lk. 24.1-53 to argue that Luke planned the conclusions of both volumes with the proof from prophecy parallel in mind.

In the same year H. Conzelmann, in his classic work on Lukan theology, presented similar conclusions on the place of the OT in Luke–Acts that can be summarized in five points.[33] (1) Luke had a twofold task in his use of the OT: (a) promise and fulfillment and (b) apologetics. (2) In ch. 24 he foreshadowed the early church's exegesis in his portrayal of Jesus' employment of Scripture for proof from prophecy. (3) He uses IF and traditional terms for Scripture (e.g., 24.44) to serve his interpretation of salvation history. (4) He links the law and the prophets together as the basis for his call to repentance and the motif of proof from prophecy and (5) presents the OT as understandable only in light of the resurrection (Lk. 24; Acts 3.13-26).

E. Franklin argues against Conzelmann's thesis that Luke replaced eschatology with salvation history to propose that Luke's purpose is to present Jesus as Lord. In his section on the OT he offers the following suggestions.[34] (1) Luke bases his understanding of Jesus on the OT, which consequently has a vital role in his presentation of Jesus, and

Acts', in *The Salvation of the Gentiles* (trans. J.R. Keating; New York: Paulist Press, 1979), pp. 129-59, who extends Schubert's thesis on the importance of Lk. 24 in application to Acts.

33. H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke* (trans. G. Buswell; London: Faber, 1960 [1954]), pp. 157-62, has a short section on the OT where he develops this theme. Cf. the similar German salvation-history perspective that emphasizes the OT in E. Lohse, 'Lukas als Theologe der Heilsgeschichte', *EvT* 14 (1954), pp. 256-75.

34. E. Franklin, *Christ the Lord* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975), pp. 48-49, 69-76, also acknowledges indebtedness to Schubert for the proof from prophecy motif.

(2) primarily uses the OT to prove that Jesus is the Christ. (3) Most distinctively, Luke provides a theology of history in which Jesus is the climax of God's workings in Israel. Since Jesus' life is an aspect in Israel's history, Luke uses it as the basis for his distinctive, typological Christology of Servant, Prophet and Lord. (4) Finally, Franklin proposes three other characteristics of Luke's OT usage: (a) Luke's LXX-imitation style is not due to dramatic interest but due to his theology of history that views Jesus as the fulfillment of the OT. (b) Luke's theology of history determines his use and alteration of OT quotations. (c) The OT's picture of God provides Luke's view of salvation through Jesus (i.e., the Gentile mission) and his subordinationist Christology.

N.A. Dahl also presents a helpful essay on Luke's use of proof from OT prophecy; his thoughts may be summarized in three points.[35] (1) Because Luke wrote his two-volume work as a continuation of OT history, he employed the promise and fulfillment theme to connect the Testaments. (2) In Luke–Acts proof from prophecy has a distinctive two-step scheme: Christ had to suffer; Jesus was the Christ. (3) Luke applied this two-step scheme to make the passion and resurrection the main evidence for Jesus' identification as the prophesied messiah (Ps. 118.22 in Lk. 20.17; Acts 4.11).

The final proponent of proof from prophecy to be mentioned is J.T. Sanders.[36] Although he finds that Luke cited the OT for various purposes, such as to give rules for Christian living (e.g., Lk. 10.27), he defines Luke's theology of Scripture as prophetic and predicting two events: the death and resurrection of Jesus and the beginning of the early church (e.g., Luke 24), and the rejection of the gospel by the Jews and its acceptance by the Gentiles (e.g., Acts 13.47).

Despite a near consensus that fulfilled prophecy is the primary purpose in Luke's OT usage, there have been a few dissenting voices.[37]

35. N.A. Dahl, 'The Purpose of Luke–Acts', in *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976), pp. 87-98. In an earlier essay in the same book, 'The Story of Abraham in Luke–Acts', pp. 66-86, he claims to follow Schubert, his colleague at Yale, for the proof from prophecy thesis.

36. J.T. Sanders, 'The Prophetic Use of the Scriptures in Luke–Acts', in C.A. Evans and W.H. Stinespring (eds.), *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), pp. 191-98.

37. E.g., two articles in the same issue of *NTS* briefly reject Schubert's thesis while focusing on other matters: A. Ehrhardt, 'The Disciples of Emmaus', *NTS* 10

Recently C.H. Talbert has attacked the majority view with the following evaluation.[38] (1) Although there are some examples of the proof from prophecy motif in Luke's OT usage (e.g., Lk. 4.16-30), the hermeneutical (e.g., Acts 7), typological (e.g., Lk. 7.11-17), and the legal and ethical (e.g., Lk. 2.23-24) usages do not fit this pattern. (2) Furthermore, proof from prophecy is broader than OT fulfillment as evidenced by the Gospel's inclusion of prophecies from an angel (1.13-17), the risen Christ (24.28-49), the earthly Jesus (9.22) and living prophets (1.67-69). (3) Talbert questions the validity of the thesis of proof from prophecy because he thinks that we cannot infer from what Luke said (i.e, a citation of a prophecy) why he said it (i.e., proof from the citation). (4) Finally, while proof from prophecy is *a* major theme in Luke–Acts, it is not *the* major or only one.

Old Testament Christology

The two works that deal with OT Christology in Luke–Acts, those of M. Rese and D.L. Bock, are redactional analyses that look at key OT christological texts.

M. Rese treats selected quotations, allusions and christological titles; he first examines Acts and then Luke and asks three questions from each text: What is the text? How is it cited (text form)? Why is it cited?[39] He classifies the OT citations according to function in four categories: (1) A *hermeneutical* quotation explains or interprets a NT event as a divine act (e.g., Acts 2.17-21). (2) A *simple Scripture proof* is an OT text cited to prove rather than explain a NT event (e.g., Acts 2.22-36), but it is not proof from prophecy because no time element is present. (3) *Scripture proof in the scheme of fulfillment and prophecy* stresses the *present* fulfillment of an OT prophecy (e.g., Acts 13.32-35).

(1964), pp. 187 n. 2, 188 n. 4, opposes the view that proof from prophecy is the key to Lk. 24 and asserts it previously belonged to Q rather than being distinctively Lukan. H.H. Oliver, 'The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke–Acts', *NTS* 10 (1964), pp. 225-26, rejects the motif, claiming that eschatology is the key to Lukan theology.

38. C.H. Talbert, 'Promise and Fulfillment in Lucan Theology', in C.H. Talbert (ed.), *Luke–Acts* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), pp. 91-103, rejects the proof from prophecy position by following Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive*, esp. pp. 134, 209 (discussed in the next section on OT Christology) in critique of Schubert. See Talbert, 'Promise and Fulfillment', nn. 1-9, for a list of proponents, of which the most significant works have been discussed above.

39. Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive*.

(4) *Scripture proof in the scheme of prophecy and fulfillment* emphasizes a *past* promise (e.g., Acts 3.26).[40] Although Rese fails to draw specific conclusions, he embraces the following: (1) Luke created the quotations that only appear in his unique material and (2) freely alters texts for theological purposes. (3) He did not primarily use the OT for proof from prophecy but for hermeneutical purposes. (4) Luke does not have an adoptionistic Christology and does not know the atoning significance of Christ's death.

D.L. Bock's dissertation consists of a seriatim analysis of selected christological OT quotations and allusions in Luke 1–Acts 13.[41] It was written in response to Rese with a primary goal of re-evaluating the proof from prophecy theme. His investigation is divided into five stages: the text form of quotations, their tradition history, their contexts, their hermeneutic[42] and their historicity. Based on sequential order the work argues that Luke begins with the motif of the regal messiah, adds the servant messiah, and ends with the theme of Jesus as Lord of all (Acts 10.36). Moreover, it proposes that when Luke has shown that Jesus is Lord of all (Acts 10), he stops his OT Christology shortly after that (Acts 13) to focus on the Gentile mission. The book concludes with a list of its five contributions: (1) Luke's christological portrayal advances from regal messiah-servant to Lord of all. (2) His conceptual form of argumentation is not dependent on the LXX. (3) The Lukan hermeneutic is 'proclamation from prophecy and pattern [i.e., typology]' not proof from prophecy (Schubert) nor its rejection (Rese). (4) The study has challenged Rese's. (5) Luke's OT Christology was designed to calm any possible doubts the early church had about Jesus' place in God's plan and offer of salvation to all.

40. Both (3) and (4) deal with prophecy and fulfillment although they have a different emphasis in the time element, i.e., on the present fulfillment or the past prophecy. Also, Rese only mentions typology twice and limits the usage to Acts 7 (*Alttestamentliche Motive*, pp. 40 n. 125, 209).

41. Bock, *Proclamation* is a revision of his 1982 dissertation (updating literature through 1984) under I.H. Marshall. See pp. 47-53, for his method; pp. 261-79, for his conclusions.

42. The hermeneutical examination stresses his classification system of OT usages: typological-prophetic, analogy, illustration, legal proof, proof passage, explanatory/hermeneutical, and prophetic. For detail see Book, *Proclamation*, pp. 49-51.

Dissertations on Selected Texts

Three writers who deal with the OT in a specific section of Luke are L.C. Crockett, R.B. Sloan and W.J. Larkin.

L.C. Crockett examines Isa. 61.1-2 in Lk. 4.18-19 through a study of the textual history of the citation and its allusions in Luke–Acts.[43] From the OT background of Lk. 14.15-24 he reaches the following conclusions: (1) Luke begins a messianic banquet motif in 4.18-19, weaves it throughout Luke–Acts, and employs it in his main theological emphases. (2) He uses the midrashic technique of enriching (i.e., joining verbally similar LXX texts) based on Isa. 61.6 and 58.7 to provide this theme. (3) Luke 4.16-30 is a commentary on Isa. 61.1-2 and Mark 6 to show Nazareth's guilt, forgiveness and inclusion in the banquet. (4) He correlates the banquet midrash with his theology of Elijah (4.25-27; 10.7-9; 11.22; 22.35-37). For example, the banquet motif appears in 4.25 where a Gentile feeds Elijah and in 22.35-37 where Jesus is depicted as a type of Elijah isolated by the unfaithful. (5) Finally, Luke combines the theme of the banquet (4.18-19) and the Elijah–Elisha allusions (4.25-27) to stress the inclusion of Jew and Gentile in table fellowship.

R.B. Sloan also does a text-form and exegetical study of the same passages, Isa. 61.1-2 in Lk. 4.18-19 (and allusions elsewhere in Luke).[44] He seeks to determine the extent of the Jubilee background of these texts and its implications, and argues the following points: (1) Isa. 61.1-2 has allusions to the year of Jubilee legislation (Lev. 25.8-55; Exod. 21.2-6; 23.10-12; Deut. 15.1-18; 31.9-13) that were recognized by Jesus' hearers and Luke's readers. (2) It is used in Lk. 4.16-30 to emphasize this background and give it an eschatological application (4.21). (3) It contains the key Jubilee term ἄφεσις, and the insertion of Isa. 58.6, which also contains ἄφεσις, strengthens

43. L.C. Crockett, 'The Old Testament in the Gospel of Luke: with Special Emphasis on the Interpretation of Isaiah 61.1-2' (PhD dissertation, Brown University, 1966), esp. pp. 277-367. Cf. *idem*, 'Luke 4.25-27 and Jewish–Gentile Relations in Luke–Acts', *JBL* 88 (1969), pp. 177-83, for a brief presentation of his thesis.

44. R.B. Sloan, *The Favorable Year of the Lord* (Austin, TX: Schola Press, 1977), esp. pp. 28-110, is the published form of a dissertation completed at Basel under B. Reicke and M. Barth. Cf. P. Liu, 'The Poor and the Good News' (PhD dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1981), another dissertation on these texts; it focuses on the role of the poor in Luke–Acts against the background of Isa. 61.

the Jubilee motif in Lk. 4.18-19. (4) In addition, the Jubilee motifs in 4.16-30 have christological implications that picture Jesus functioning as the messiah and as the eschatological prophet like Moses who brings in the eschatological Jubilee. (5) These motifs also occur in several other places in Luke, especially in 6.20-38 and 11.2-4. (6) The Jubilee background has important implications for Luke's theology and purpose of proclaiming God's eschatological salvation.[45]

W.J. Larkin's study on the OT in Luke's passion narrative analyzes each pericope in Luke 22–23[46] through an investigation of four types of OT usages (quotation, allusion, idea and LXX-style imitation) that are classified in four categories.[47] The final part of his work summarizes the results of the study and conclusions on Luke's OT employment. First, its results can be listed as follows: Luke has great diversity in his OT usage and generally uses quotations and allusions as pointers to their larger OT contexts. Although he usually respects the OT's context, sometimes he allows NT events to adjust it. He uses pre-Lukan sources for all his OT usage and omits certain quotations and allusions in his sources to allow his readers to relive his narrative without interruptions from the OT. He does not permit his citations and allusions to influence his LXX imitation but only his theological themes. Secondly, its conclusions on Luke's use of OT are as follows: (1) Luke cites Isa. 53.12 in 22.37 as the basis to weave the themes of Jesus' innocence and suffering according to God's will as revealed in the OT throughout the passion narrative. (2) In Luke 22–23 he uses

45. Sloan, *Favorable Year*, pp. 154-65, notes this in opposition to Conzelmann's Hegelian reconstruction of Luke's theology, i.e., the imminent expectation of the parousia by the early church (thesis) and the problem of its delay (antithesis) was resolved by the theology of salvation history portrayed in Luke–Acts (synthesis).

46. Larkin, 'The Old Testament in Luke 22–23', esp. pp. 636-99, is a dissertation written under C.K. Barrett. Cf. W.J. Larkin, Jr, 'Toward a Holistic Description of Luke's Use of the Old Testament', *Evangelical Theological Society Papers* (Portland: Theological Research Exchange Network, 1987), pp. 1-18; and *idem*, 'Luke's Use of the Old Testament as a Key to his Soteriology', *JETS* 20 (1977), pp. 325-35, for his approach on a smaller scale.

47. The categories are as follows: (1) an interpretive text places events in a narrative into an eschatological or theological context, (2) a simple proof text gives a prediction without an explicit promise-fulfillment framework, (3) a fulfillment proof text is a prediction within a promise-fulfillment framework, and (4) an illustrative text uses OT language to describe NT events which fulfill OT prophecies.

two interpretive schemes in his OT usage: promise fulfillment and recurring patterns of salvation history. (3) Lastly, he allows two factors to control his use of the OT: Jesus' methods of interpretation and the historical events of the Gospel tradition.

The Present Study

As stated above, the present work will inquire into Jesus' expositions of explicit OT quotations, that is, his exegetical methods and his use of Scripture, as portrayed by Luke in light of the exegetical methods of first-century Judaism.[48] In building on previous studies, it will extend

48. Only two dated dissertations and a few essays have been devoted to the study of Jesus' exegetical methods: E.E. Tilden, Jr, 'The Functions of the Old Testament in the Sayings of Jesus as Recorded in the Synoptic Gospels' (PhD dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1945); W.E. Sanders, 'A Study of the Method of Jesus in his Interpretation of the Old Testament' (ThD dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1948); T.W. Manson, 'The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus', *BJRL* 34 (1951–52), pp. 312-32; E.E. Tilden, 'The Study of Jesus' Interpretive Methods', *Int* 7 (1953), pp. 45-61; B.D. Chilton, *A Galilean Rabbi and his Bible* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1984); and Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 125-38. Only the last two works seriously consider Jesus' exegetical methods in light of the methods of first-century Judaism.

Several works have been written on other areas of Jesus' use of the OT: E.C.S. Gibson, 'Our Lord's Use of the Old Testament', *The Expositor* 1 (1881), pp. 292-304; R.F. Horton, 'Christ's Use of the Book of Proverbs', *The Expositor* 7 (1888), pp. 105-23; J. Meinhold, *Jesus und das Alte Testament* (Leipzig: Mohr, 1896); M. Kähler, *Jesus und das Alte Testament* (Neukirchen–Vlyun: Neukirchener Verlag, 1896); J.P. Peters, 'Christ's Treatment of the Old Testament', *JBL* 15 (1896), pp. 87-105; D.J. Burrell, *The Teaching of Jesus concerning the Scriptures* (New York: American Tract Society, 1904); C.S. MacFarland, *Jesus and the Prophets* (New York: Knickerbocker, 1905); A.H. McNeile, 'Our Lord's Use of the Old Testament', in H.B. Swete (ed.), *Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day* (London: Macmillan, 1909), pp. 215-50; E. Clapton, *Our Lord's Quotations from the Old Testament* (London: Skeffington, 1922); G.H. Gilbert, *Jesus and his Bible* (New York: Macmillan, 1926); W.M. Grant, *The Bible of Jesus* (New York: Doran, 1927); H.E. Dana, 'Jesus' Use of the Old Testament', *Biblical Review* 16 (1931), pp. 389-99; A. Oepke, *Jesus und das Alte Testament* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1938); G.C. Morgan, *Christ and the Bible* (Clapham Park: Queensgate, n.d.); R.V.G. Tasker, *Our Lord's Use of the Old Testament* (Glasgow: Rickering & Inglis, 1953); J.W. Wenham, *Our Lord's View of the Old Testament* (London: Tyndale Press, 1953); *idem*, *Christ and the Bible* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1972); J.G.S.S. Thomson, 'Christ and the Old Testament', *ExpTim* 67 (1965), pp. 18-20;

particularly those on midrash as commentary technique and pattern, an area in which no works have been devoted on Luke. In turn, it will meet two of the current research needs in the study of the OT in Luke: an examination of the Lukan exegetical milieu and an exegetical and literary analysis of the Lukan accounts of Jesus' expositions of explicit OT quotations.[49]

Before pursuing this study the pre-resurrection origin of Jesus' OT citations and expositions will be addressed since classical form critics and those they have influenced often reject the pre-resurrection origin of Jesus' OT quotations and expositions, relegating them to post-resurrection creations of the early church.

The Pre-resurrection Origin of the Old Testament Expositions Ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels

Form criticism[50] seeks to discover the original setting and historical development of the forms of the Jesus tradition. In this procedure it combines a literary analysis of the Gospels and a reconstruction of the *Sitz im Leben* of Jesus and of his early followers to postulate the

R.T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament* (London: Tyndale Press, 1971); W. Grimm and O. Betz, *Jesus und das Danielbuch* (2 vols.; New York: Peter Lang, 1984–85); and P. Sigal, *The Halakah of Jesus of Nazareth according to the Gospel of Matthew* (New York: University Press of America, 1986). See the works cited in Sigal for older studies on Jesus' relation to the Mosaic law.

49. Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, pp. 107-108, in his recent history of research calls for (1) a study of the exegetical milieu and method of Luke and (2) a literary analysis of the narratives containing OT citations. I will limit this study to Jesus' OT usage in expository episodes in light of Jewish exegetical methods since the OT primarily appears on his lips in Luke and since his expositions warrant a more comprehensive study than has previously been done.

50. The two pioneer works that established and largely shaped the discipline in its classic form are M. Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel* (trans. B.L. Woolf; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2nd edn, 1935 [1919]); and R. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. J. Marsh, New York: Harper, rev. edn, 1963 [1921]). Bultmann's book has been more influential, and it deals with all of the Synoptic tradition unlike Dibelius's. Cf. K.L. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (Berlin: Trowitzsch, 1919). For a summary of this discipline with attention to the above pioneers, see E.V. McKnight, *What is Form Criticism?* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969); and S.H. Travis, 'Form Criticism', in I.H. Marshall (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), pp. 153-64.

origin and development of the Jesus tradition before its incorporation into the Gospels.

As a method of literary analysis it is accepted by most NT scholars.[51] But as it is practiced in its classical form, it is rejected by many scholars for its extreme skepticism of the pre-resurrection origin of the Gospel traditions. This skepticism is evident in its theological and historical presuppositions[52] and its use of criteria for authenticity, all of which have a profound effect on its estimation of the Gospel tradition.[53]

51. For a positive appraisal, see Blomberg, *Historical Reliability*, pp. 22-24. Otherwise: Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, p. 178, contends the forms are not cognate to the Gospels because they are Greek rather than Jewish in character.

52. Since those who accept and reject the authenticity of Gospel tradition both work with the same materials, their presuppositions determine their methodology and appraisals. For a list and critique of the presuppositions of classical form criticism, see, e.g., E.E. Ellis, 'Gospels Criticism', in P. Stuhlmacher (ed.), *The Gospel and the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), pp. 37-41. This discussion will select those most pertinent to Jesus' OT usage in the Gospels. For further discussion and criticism of these presuppositions from an evangelical mindset, see, e.g., R.H. Stein, *The Synoptic Problem* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), pp. 161-86; and R.T. France, 'The Authenticity of the Sayings of Jesus', in C. Brown (ed.), *History, Criticism and Faith* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1976), pp. 103-107. As related specifically to the OT citations in the Gospels, see France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 18-22; and Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, pp. 188-93.

53. This extreme skepticism and the use of criteria for establishing authenticity are hallmarks both of the works of the SBL historical Jesus seminar and of the third quest for the historical Jesus. (1) The results of the SBL seminar are given in R.W. Funk, B.B. Scott and J.R. Butts, *The Parables of Jesus: Red Letter Edition* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1988); and R.W. Funk and M.H. Smith, *The Gospel of Mark: Red Letter Edition* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1991). (2) Representatives of the third quest are as follows: B.F. Meyer, *The Aims of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1979); G. Vermes, *Jesus and the World of Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983); E.P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985); M.J. Borg, *Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus* (New York: Edwin Mellen, 1984); *idem*, *Jesus: A New Vision* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987); A.E. Harvey, *Jesus and the Constraints of History* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982); J.H. Charlesworth, *Jesus within Judaism* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1988); R.A. Horsley, *Sociology and the Jesus Movement* (New York: Crossroad, 1989); J.D. Crossan, *The Historical Jesus* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1991); and J.P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1991). Assessments of these and

Theological Presuppositions

Skeptical Assumptions. Opponents of the classical school have rejected as invalid the following three theological assumptions of classical form criticism: first, rather than a theistic, open world-view, R. Bultmann espouses a closed world-view that is grounded in rationalistic deism; therefore, he sees the NT world-view as mythical and obsolete. This is especially evident in his rejection of the historical reliability of the Gospel accounts of the miracles of Jesus and of his resurrection from the dead.[54]

Secondly, Bultmann also has a negative view of the OT that can be seen in his characterization of it: '*To the Christian faith the Old Testament is no longer revelation* as it has been and still is for the Jews'. It 'is not in the true sense God's Word'.[55] Consequently, he and his followers are skeptical of the pre-resurrection origin of the OT citations attributed to Jesus in the Gospels and argue that they are out of context and valueless.[56]

additional studies are given in the following works: S. Neill and T. Wright, *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861–1986* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd edn, 1988), pp. 379-403; C.A. Evans, 'Jesus of Nazareth', *Crux* 23 (1987), pp. 15-19; *idem*, 'The Historical Jesus and the Christian Faith', *Christian Scholar's Review* 18 (1988), pp. 48-63; and C. Brown, 'Historical Jesus, Quest of', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 203-206.

54. R. Bultmann, 'New Testament and Mythology', in H.W. Bartsch (ed.), *Kerygma and Myth* (trans. R.H. Fuller; London: SPCK, 1953), pp. 1-44, rejects the NT world-view and its acceptance of the miraculous; he holds to a 'modern' view which sees the world as immune from the supernatural. Cf. *idem*, *Jesus Christ and Mythology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958); and *idem*, 'Is Exegesis without Presuppositions Possible?', in *Existence and Faith* (trans. S.M. Ogden; New York: World, 1960), pp. 291-92.

55. R. Bultmann, 'The Significance of the Old Testament for the Christian Faith', in B.W. Anderson (ed. and trans.), *The Old Testament and the Christian Faith* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), pp. 31-33. Cf. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 144-45; and *idem*, 'Gospels Criticism', p. 39, who characterizes this as a Marcionite attitude toward the OT.

56. E.g., Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, p. 49, claims the church often added OT quotations to the NT text. He admits that 'now and again' Jesus and the church may have also used the same citation, but he thinks that this is impossible to establish. E.g., he calls Jesus' Nazareth sermon of Lk. 4.16-30 'an imaginary situation [that] is built up out of an independent saying [Pap. Ox. 1.5]' (pp. 31-32). For his other rejections of the authenticity of OT citations in the Gospels, see, e.g., pp. 16-17, 26-27, 46-50, 125, *passim*. Cf. N. Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*

Thirdly, Bultmann and his school also find a great gulf between Jesus and the Gospels, so that they are skeptical of knowing anything without doubt about the earthly Jesus.[57] Instead, they presume that post-resurrection church creations and alterations of the Jesus tradition make up the bulk of the Gospels.[58]

Because of their skeptical approach to the Gospels, classical form critics search for the originator of each saying attributed to Jesus, asking whether it comes from Jesus, Judaism or the early church. For example, whenever they find a possible *Sitz im Leben Kirche*, which quite likely is due to the church's adaptation of a Jesus tradition, they assume that the passage is a church creation without roots in the historical Jesus. Thus, they allow the search for the *Sitz im Leben* to become a quest for the originator of the text.[59] Consequently, they conclude that much of the Gospels is a church creation, they place the burden of proof on those who support the pre-resurrection origin of the saying, and they set up criteria for distinguishing between the teachings of the historical Jesus and theological reflections of the early church that are present in the Gospels.

Authenticity Criteria. Four principal criteria are employed by classical form critics to determine whether a given saying or action attributed to Jesus in the Gospels can be proved to have originated in his earthly ministry. These criteria are as follows: dissimilarity,

(New York: Harper & Row, 1967), e.g., pp. 27-28, 176-77, *passim*; and R.H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), pp. 108-19.

57. R. Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word* (trans. L.P. Smith and E.H. Lantero; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), p. 8, writes, 'I do indeed think that we can now know almost nothing about the life and personality of Jesus'. See also Perrin, *Rediscovering*, esp. pp. 15-53, which is a thoroughgoing English application of Bultmann's form-critical views based on the principle 'when in doubt, discard'.

58. This assumption is rooted in a Hegelian view of history combined with an erroneous portrait of Jesus and the early church (i.e., an apocalyptic Jesus + a delayed parousia = the Gospels as post-resurrection creations about Jesus).

59. Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, p. 4, sees this as the main task of form criticism rather than the classification of literary forms. Similarly, Perrin, *Rediscovering*, *passim*. See the criticism of V. Taylor, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (London: Macmillan, 2nd edn, 1935), pp. 34-38, who objects that 'this transcends any principles belonging to form, and really is a study of historical probability'. Cf. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, pp. 177-78.

multiple attestation, Palestinian/Aramaic flavor, and coherence.[60]

A number of scholars have persuasively argued that, although these criteria may raise certain probabilities of a pre-resurrection origin of a particular pericope, they provide no assured results. They aptly criticize each of the criteria used by classical form criticism and show their need of revision or even outright rejection. Furthermore, some have proposed similar criteria that begin with the assumption of the historical reliability of the Gospels rather than with historical skepticism.[61]

60. See, e.g., Perrin, *Rediscovering*, pp. 38-47, an adherent to the Bultmann school who has perhaps best typified the classical use of the criteria in recent years. Several scholars, both who follow and oppose Bultmann, have modified his approach; yet they retain dissimilarity as the essential criterion of the discipline and make those sayings suspect that do not prove dissimilar. See also E. Käsemann, 'The Problem of the Historical Jesus', in *Essays on New Testament Themes* (trans. W.J. Montague; London: SCM Press, 1964), pp. 15-47, a follower of Bultmann; and H.E.W. Turner, *Historicity and the Gospels* (London: Mowbrays, 1963), pp. 58-108, an opponent of the Bultmann school, who argues for the historicity of the sayings but still uses the criterion of dissimilarity. Cf. B. Witherington, III, *The Christology of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), pp. 27-31, who plays down the importance of the criterion of dissimilarity but employs other criteria: multiple attestation, coherence, Aramaic/Palestinian flavor and scholarly consensus.

61. The classic article in this area is M.D. Hooker, 'On Using the Wrong Tool', *Theology* 75 (1972), pp. 570-81. See also, e.g., *idem*, 'Christology and Methodology', *NTS* 17 (1971), pp. 480-87; W.O. Walker, 'The Quest for the Historical Jesus', *ATR* 51 (1969), pp. 38-56; D.G.A. Calvert, 'An Examination of the Criteria for Distinguishing the Authentic Words of Jesus', *NTS* 18 (1972), pp. 209-18; N.J. McEleney, 'Authenticating Criteria and Mark 7.1-23', *CBQ* 34 (1972), pp. 431-60; G. Stanton, 'Form Criticism Revisited', in M. Hooker and C. Hickling (eds.), *What about the New Testament?* (London: SCM Press, 1975), pp. 13-27; R.N. Longenecker, 'Literary Criteria in Life of Jesus Research', in G.F. Hawthorne (ed.), *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), pp. 217-29; France, 'Authenticity', pp. 110-14; D.C. Catchpole, 'Tradition History', in I.H. Marshall (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), pp. 165-80; D.L. Mealand, 'The Dissimilarity Test', *SJT* 31 (1978), pp. 41-50; D.A. Carson, 'Redaction Criticism', in D.A. Carson and J.D. Woodbridge (eds.), *Scripture and Truth* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), pp. 119-28; D. Polkow, 'Method and Criteria for Historical Jesus Research', in K.H. Richards (ed.), *SBL 1987 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), pp. 336-56; and C.L. Blomberg, 'Form Criticism', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 243-50.

For a critique of the classical form criteria and an evangelical use of certain form

The criterion of *dissimilarity* alleges that a saying or action of Jesus must be without parallel both in the early church and in Judaism to be assigned a pre-resurrection origin.[62] For classical form critics this criterion has remained the chief method and main test to determine the authenticity of the Jesus tradition, although in consideration of the NT milieu it must be rejected. There are at least two significant problems with this criterion. The first problem is that this criterion demonstrates what is unique to Jesus but not necessarily what is characteristic of him; by a priori definition it disregards all Jewish and Christian parallels, many of which may represent some of Jesus' characteristic teachings. The second problem is that the criterion presumes that we possess sufficient knowledge of first-century Judaism and Christianity for such a comparison, yet one cannot be certain of this or what is truly distinctive of Jesus.

Because of historical skepticism and especially because of the use of the dissimilarity criterion by classical form critics, the OT quotations, allusions and expositions ascribed to Jesus are often held to derive from the early church rather than from the earthly Jesus. Because this criterion rejects traditions that overlap with the tendencies of the early church and of first-century Judaism, the quotations, allusions and expositions of the OT ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels are frequently assigned to typical Jewish usage (e.g., Deut. 6.4-5; Lev. 19.18 in Mk 12.28-34) or Christian apologetic (e.g, Ps. 118.22-23 in Mk 12.10-11). In arguing that this criterion is defective and in need

criteria that start from the assumption of authenticity rather than classical form criticism's skepticism, see, esp. R.H. Stein, 'The "Criteria" for Authenticity', in R.T. France and D. Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), I, pp. 225-63; and C.A. Evans, 'Authenticity Criteria in Life of Jesus Research', *Christian Scholar's Review* 19 (1989), pp. 6-31.

62. This can be found throughout Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, e.g., pp. 101-105, *passim*, esp. p. 205 for his clearest statement. Instead of a Jesus with similarities to Judaism or the early church, Bultmann looks for teachings that are consistent with his presupposed picture of Jesus as an eschatological prophet. Cf. R.H. Fuller, *Interpreting the Miracles* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), pp. 26-27, who has a succinct summary of this principle: '(1) If it [i.e., the Jesus saying] reflects the faith of the church after the resurrection, it must be regarded as a creation of the church, rather than an authentic saying of Jesus. (2) If there is a parallel saying attributed to a Rabbi, it must be held as a Jewish tradition which has erroneously been attributed to Jesus. But if it is neither—if it is clearly distinct both from the faith of the church and from Judaism—then it may be safely accepted as authentic.'

of revision, C.A. Evans demonstrates that we would expect to find many similarities between Jesus and the early church and between Jesus and Judaism. (1) The early church as the followers of the historical Jesus would depend on his teachings as central to theirs, so that they would preserve the traditions they found relevant. (2) Jesus should be at one with Judaism in many places since he was a Jew who ministered in a first-century Palestinian setting.[63]

In his recent study on Jesus and his Bible, E.E. Ellis further refutes the opinion that the OT references and expositions attributed to Jesus are almost always creations of the church. He argues that the form critics have read the historical situation precisely backwards and that Jesus was required to establish his teachings on biblical exegesis to be accepted as a religious teacher by his Jewish audience (cf. Deut. 13.1-5). He concludes that Jesus' biblical expositions are 'the bedrock of his teaching and of the Synoptic tradition, and from a form critical perspective they cannot be regarded as creations of the Gospel traditioners'.[64] Furthermore, we should expect the Gospels to contain numerous traditions of Jesus quoting and expounding the OT since the Gospels present him as a prophet and teacher addressing a Jewish audience in first-century Palestine.[65]

The criterion of *multiple attestation* places greater historical reliability on a saying or action of Jesus found in more than one level of the Gospel tradition (Mark, Q, M, L[66]). Again there are at least two major criticisms against the reliability of this tool. (1) This criterion may establish that the material is early and widespread, but it cannot establish that it originated with Jesus. Furthermore, (2) the criterion cannot dismiss the pre-resurrection origin of singly attested material since it may be historically reliable also.[67]

63. On the use of the OT ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels and this criterion, see C.A. Evans, 'The Function of the Old Testament in the New', in S. McKnight (ed.), *Introducing New Testament Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989), pp. 171-74; and *idem*, 'Old Testament in the Gospels', p. 579.

64. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 125-38, esp. pp. 132-34.

65. For Gospel references to Jesus as prophet and teacher (rabbi), see, e.g., F. Hauck, 'προφήτης', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 841-48; K.H. Rengstorf, 'διδάσκω', *TDNT*, II, pp. 153-57; and E. Lohse, 'ῥαββί', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 964-65.

66. In recent years some have added the *Gospel of Thomas* to this list of traditions.

67. The application of this criterion is usually based on the two document hypothesis; yet this solution to the Synoptic problem is widely questioned today. Cf.

The criterion of *Palestinian/Aramaic flavor* sees the presence of Palestinian or Aramaic features in the Gospels as strengthening their likelihood of having an origin in the ministry of the earthly Jesus. But this tool disregards the possibilities that the early church could have created a passage with Semitic features or that Jesus could have used some Greek forms of speech and concepts. It also ignores the likelihood that the traditioners or the Evangelists could have thoroughly recast originally Semitic traditions into Greek, non-Semitic forms.

The criterion of *coherence* accepts the historical reliability of passages that have been established to have a pre-resurrection origin by other means. This is a most subjective principle with the danger of circular reasoning; for only what a certain scholar presumes to be characteristic of Jesus is regarded as historically reliable. If the scholar's assumptions prove to be incorrect, his assessment of the tradition becomes suspect. The validity of this criterion is based on the previous criteria which have questionable strengths as I have shown above.[68]

Along with the criticism of the authenticity criteria, the presupposition of historical skepticism underlying these criteria has been ably countered by the revised school of form criticism. The classical school is always skeptical on the issue of the burden of proof, and it assigns the burden of proof to those who ascribe the origin of the tradition to the pre-resurrection ministry of Jesus. It assumes that each tradition in the Gospels is suspect and assigns the Gospel traditions to the post-resurrection church unless its origin in Jesus' ministry can be demonstrated by overwhelming evidence. Although this method transposes the standard procedures used elsewhere for historical investigation,[69] they still hold fast to this practice.

As will be considered below,[70] the newer, revised school of form criticism has shown that there are good reasons for accepting the historical reliability of the Gospel traditions and for assigning the

E.E. Ellis, 'The Making of Narratives in the Synoptic Gospels', in H. Wansbrough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), pp. 310-33.

68. These are the major criticisms of each of the criteria. Further criticisms are offered by the works cited in n. 61.

69. See Ellis, 'Gospels Criticism', pp. 30-31, who discusses the classic work on historical method by E. Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen methode* (n.p.: Duncker & Humblot, 1914), p. 302.

70. See the section immediately below on historical presuppositions.

burden of proof to the skeptic who contends that the particular Gospel tradition originated with the early church rather than with the historical Jesus. Rather than beginning with skepticism and authenticity criteria to prove the historical reliability of the Gospel accounts, the proper method first assumes the pre-resurrection origin of the sayings and actions ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels and then considers objections to the contrary.[71]

Historical Presuppositions

Several of classical form criticism's historical presuppositions, like their theological ones, are in need of revision. These are as follows: the Gospel tradition was exclusively oral in its initial period, had an uncontrolled folkloric transmission, and experienced a delay before becoming fixed. Also it indiscriminately mixed words of the exalted Christ spoken through Christian prophets with the traditioned words of the earthly Jesus.

The supposition of an exclusively oral, initial transmission of traditions grows out of the contention that since the early Christians held to an imminent end, they would not have put their traditions into writing. But this was proven to be erroneous by the finding of the DSS because the Qumran sectarians had both apocalyptic views and a large collection of writings. Also, this view is further refuted by a consideration of the historical milieu of Palestinian Judaism and of pre-Easter Christianity, that preserved written notes and collections of writings.[72]

The alleged folkloric context of this oral transmission is a poor analogy as folklore is passed down for over a century or more while the Gospel traditions, which were transmitted by a small religious group, only extended to thirty or forty years. Also, the meticulous preservation of oral traditions and the likelihood of early written

71. On the issue of the burden of proof, see esp. S.C. Goetz and C.L. Blomberg, 'The Burden of Proof', *JSNT* 11 (1981), pp. 39-83; L. Blomberg, 'Gospels (Historical Reliability)', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 291-97; and *idem*, *Historical Reliability*, pp. 234-54, and the works cited.

72. For more detail, see, e.g., Ellis, 'Gospels Criticism', p. 39; Stein, *Synoptic Problem*, pp. 163-65; and P. Stuhlmacher, 'The Theme: The Gospel and the Gospels', in P. Stuhlmacher (ed.), *The Gospel and the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), pp. 2-12; and the works cited.

traditions, which are discussed next, further dispute this theory.[73]

Several scholars have shown that form criticism's allegation of the unreliability of the transmission of the Gospel tradition is inconsistent with the Judaism and with the early church of the NT era. H. Riesenfeld and B. Gerhardsson demonstrate that the rabbis carefully handed down oral tradition and make an analogical comparison to argue that Jesus' pre-Easter disciples also meticulously memorized and preserved the Jesus tradition in oral and written forms.[74] R. Riesner focuses on the educational methods of ancient Israel and its neighbors rather than rabbinic practices, and concludes that Jesus' pre-resurrection followers accurately memorized and transmitted the Jesus tradition in oral and written forms.[75] Even if one does not accept all the details of their analogies, these scholars are certainly

73. For further detail, see, e.g., Ellis, 'Gospels Criticism', pp. 40-41; Stein, 'Criteria for Authenticity', pp. 226-27; Stuhlmacher, 'The Theme: The Gospel and the Gospels', pp. 2-12; and the works cited.

74. H. Riesenfeld, *The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings* (London: Mowbrays, 1957); B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript* (trans. E.J. Sharpe; Lund: Gleerup, 1961) is the major work in this area but only deals with the Synoptics in the final chapter (pp. 324-35); *idem*, *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity* (trans. E. Sharpe; Lund: Gleerup, 1964) is a response to criticisms of his former work (i.e., M. Smith, 'A Comparison of Early Christian and Early Rabbinic Tradition', *JBL* 82 [1963], pp. 169-76); *idem*, *The Origins of the Gospel Traditions* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979) is a less technical summary of the two former works; *idem*, *The Gospel Tradition* (Lund: Gleerup, 1986) presents a model to investigate tradition; and *idem*, 'The Path of the Gospel Tradition', in Stuhlmacher (ed.), *The Gospel and the Gospels*, pp. 75-96, offers a concise updated synopsis of his thesis. The two most helpful criticisms of the Scandinavians are the sympathetic appraisals of W.D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), pp. 464-80; and P.H. Davids, 'The Gospels and Jewish Tradition', in France and Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives*, I, pp. 75-99. Others have made this analogy in less detail: e.g., O. Cullmann, 'The Tradition', in A.J.B. Higgins (ed.), *The Early Church* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956), pp. 57-99; J.W. Doeve, 'La rôle de la tradition orale dans la composition des évangiles synoptiques', in J. Cambier *et al.* (eds.), *La formation des évangiles* (n.p.: Desclée & Brouwer, 1957), pp. 70-84; and J.J. Vincent, 'Did Jesus Teach his Disciples to Learn by Heart?', *SE* 3 (1964), pp. 105-64. See also the works discussed below.

75. R. Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer* (Tübingen: Mohr, 3rd edn, 1988). Cf. *idem*, 'Judische Elementarbildung und Evangelienüberlieferung', in France and Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives*, I, pp. 209-23; and *idem*, 'Der Ursprung der Jesus-Überlieferung', *TZ* 38 (1982), pp. 493-513.

correct that the Jesus tradition was transmitted in a Jewish milieu that esteemed and carefully preserved tradition, and that Jesus' disciples would have accurately preserved and transmitted the words of their teacher whom they also saw as their Lord.[76]

Two other authorities in particular have persuasively shown an early fixing of Gospel traditions that started in Jesus' pre-resurrection ministry. In a classic essay H. Schürmann demonstrates a pre-Easter *Sitz im Leben* for Jesus' teachings; he argues the following points.[77] (1) Jesus taught the disciples his teachings in an easily memorized poetic form,[78] so that they could transmit them during his life and after his death. (2) The transmission of the carefully memorized teachings of Jesus had its *Sitz im Leben Jesu* in Jesus' sending out of the disciples for missionary preaching. E.E. Ellis extends Schürmann's thesis by suggesting the following.[79] (1) Some Gospel traditions were preserved in written along with oral forms during Jesus' earthly ministry. Three of his points are particularly relevant here. (a) Since in the NT era Jewish children were habitually taught to read and write, we can assume that Jesus' disciples and converts could compose written traditions. (b) The geographical distance and absence of teaching leadership in certain places made it necessary for believers

76. This does not exclude adaptations and minor alterations in the evangelists' usage of the tradition, but this speaks against creation *de novo*.

77. H. Schürmann, 'Die vorösterlichen Anfänge der Logientradition', in *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968), pp. 39-65. Similarly, G.N. Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), argues Jesus' words and works were the primary elements in the missionary preaching of the early church from the beginning. Cf. *idem*, 'The Gospel Traditions and Early Christological Reflections', in S.W. Sykes and J.P. Clayton (eds.), *Christ, Faith and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), pp. 191-204.

78. See also R.H. Stein, *The Method and Message of Jesus' Teaching* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978); and C.F. Burney, *The Poetry of Our Lord* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925).

79. Ellis, 'New Directions', pp. 237-53. For other proponents of written traditions, see, e.g., M. Hengel, *Between Jesus and Paul* (trans. J. Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), pp. 1-29; Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, pp. 181-83; Davids, 'Gospels and Jewish Tradition', pp. 75-99; Blomberg, *Historical Reliability*, pp. 24-25; Riesner, *Jesus*; Gerhardsson, *Memory*, p. 358; *idem*, *Origins*, p. 23; and Stein, *Synoptic Problem*, p. 210.

to possess written traditions from an early period; thus, it is likely that disciples would have left behind written tracts on missionary tours during Jesus' lifetime. (c) The use of Greek in Palestinian Judaism and by Jesus' pre-resurrection followers supports the thesis of an early formulation of written traditions for ministry to Greek-speaking converts. (2) Certain types of biblical expositions (i.e., *proem* and *yelammedenu*) present in the Gospels must be seen as a form with a *Sitz im Leben Jesu.*

The last assumption to be addressed is the form critic's claim of an indiscriminate mixing of prophetic dominical oracles among the traditioned words of the historical Jesus, an assumption proposing that post-resurrection Christian prophets created many of the sayings attributed to the historical Jesus and that the church failed to distinguish between the two.[80] Although it is certain that the Evangelists creatively altered some Gospel traditions in adaptation as can be seen in a synopsis of the Gospels,[81] a number of scholars have shown that there is little evidence to support the theory of a creation and mixing of prophetic dominical sayings with the words of the earthly Jesus. Among others, D. Hill argues that the NT passages (esp. Rev. 3.20; 16.15; cf. *Odes* 42.6) adduced by the Bultmannians do not show the attribution of words of the resurrected Christ to the historical Jesus because these words are clearly designated as post-resurrection sayings, and that the apostles rather than a separate group of prophets were the early church leaders and would not have accepted a *de novo*

80. See, e.g., Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 127-28; Perrin, *Rediscovering*, p. 15; and M.E. Boring, *Sayings of the Risen Jesus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982). For a mediating position from an evangelical mindset that permits this in a limited fashion, see, e.g., G.F. Hawthorne, 'The Role of Christian Prophets in the Gospel Tradition', in G.F. Hawthorne and O. Betz (eds.), *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), pp. 119-33; I.H. Marshall, *I Believe in the Historical Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), pp. 192-94; Ellis, 'Gospels Criticism', pp. 28, 41-43; and *idem*, 'Luke xi.49-51', *ExpTim* 74 (1963), pp. 157-58.

81. France, 'Authenticity', p. 125, rightly states that 'while it is undeniable that the Evangelists and their predecessors adapted, selected and reshaped the material which came down to them, there is no reason to extend this "freedom" to include the *creation* of new sayings attributed to Jesus; that in fact such, evidence as we have points decisively the other way, to a respect for the sayings of Jesus as such which was sufficient to prevent any of his followers attributing their own teaching to him'.

creation of Jesus' sayings.[82] Further, R. Guelich, in summarizing the results of a 1982 international symposium on the theme of 'the gospel and the Gospels' in Tübingen, writes, 'these data provide little evidence that sayings from the exalted Christ received by early Christian prophets were transferred at some point in the tradition to the status of sayings of the earthly Jesus'.[83]

Furthermore, since the present study deals with Jesus' expositions of the OT in Luke's Gospel, I.H. Marshall's recent evaluation of Luke as a historian and theologian is especially pertinent. He shows that Luke was an accurate, credible historian who did not write a work of creative imagination for purposes of early church theology, but he wrote a work of reliable history that was controlled by his sources of the Gospel tradition, sources that included Jesus' quotation and exposition of the OT.[84]

Conclusion

In light of the above responses to the major presuppositions of classical form criticism by the advocates of the revised school of form criticism (or 'historicist' approach), one should, therefore, adopt the following assumptions toward the Jesus tradition as it is preserved in the canonical Gospels: a theistic world-view, a continuity between Jesus and the early church, a controlled environment of tradition that thus includes some written material dating to Jesus' earthly ministry, and a complexity of written material before the composition of the Gospels.

With these in mind we can be confident that the Jesus tradition as it is preserved in the canonical Gospels is historically reliable, and

82. D. Hill, 'On the Evidence for the Creative Role of Christian Prophets', *NTS* 20 (1974), pp. 262-74; and *idem*, *New Testament Prophecy* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1979), pp. 146-85. Cf. F. Neugebauer, 'Geistsprüche und Jesuslogien', *ZNW* 53 (1962), pp. 218-28; D.E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), pp. 233-45; J.D.G. Dunn, 'Prophetic "I" Sayings and the Jesus Tradition', *NTS* 24 (1978), pp. 175-98; and G.B. Caird, 'The Study of the Gospels II: Form Criticism', *ExpTim* 87 (1976), pp. 137-51.

83. R. Guelich, 'Introduction', in Stuhlmacher (ed.), *The Gospel and the Gospels*, p. xx.

84. I.H. Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2nd edn, 1989).

consequently also that Jesus was an expositor of the OT as the Gospels depict him. The historicist school has proved that the skeptical school's rejection of *inter alia* the authenticity of most of Jesus' OT usage as creations of the post-resurrection church and their allegation that we can know little about the historical Jesus is erroneous. Therefore, we may commence with an investigation of the Jewish exegetical milieu of Jesus' OT expositions (Chapter 2) and an examination of his OT citations and expositions in light of this exegetical milieu (Chapters 3 and 4).

Chapter 2

THE EXEGETICAL MILIEU OF LUKE'S GOSPEL

Since Jesus was a Jew like all the NT writers,[1] since he claimed to fulfill OT prophecy[2] and Judaism as a whole,[3] and since he ministered in a Palestinian Jewish environment, it is necessary to investigate the exegetical practices of first-century Judaism for a proper understanding of his exposition of Scripture as presented by Luke.[4] This chapter will examine the Jewish exegetical procedures used in the NT era as a bridge to examine Jesus' exegetical methods and expositions of Scripture in Chapters 3 and 4 below. It will focus on the exegetical methods that are applied to biblical quotations and the resulting commentary.[5]

1. Luke is the only NT writer whom many scholars identify as a Gentile, but persuasive arguments have been offered for his Jewishness. See, e.g., Ellis, *Luke*, pp. 51-53, and the works cited.

2. E.g., Lk. 4.16-21.

3. See esp. Mt. 5.17-20; cf. Lk. 16.16-17.

4. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, p. 1, writes, 'The possibilities of coming to a proper understanding of an antique document [and therefore of Jesus' exposition of the OT in Luke] accrue according to the degree in which one knows the milieu whence it came'. Cf. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 11-15.

5. This chapter generally will focus on hermeneutical practices (i.e., exegetical methods) rather than hermeneutical axioms (i.e., presuppositions). Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 19-20, provides a concise summary of the axioms that all ancient Jewish interpreters shared despite their differing methods: (1) The Scriptures were inspired. (2) The Torah, written and oral, contained the entire truth for humanity's direction. (3) The task of the interpreter involved both plain or obvious meanings and implied or deduced meanings of the text. (4) The purpose of biblical interpretation was adapting Scripture to life's present situations. For more detailed studies of the hermeneutical axioms of ancient Judaism, see esp. D. Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975); and D.J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narrative* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983), pp. 56-75.

The following six areas of the Jewish exegetical milieu of the Gospel of Luke will be investigated: Scripture quotations and allusions, introductory formulas (IF), other exegetical terminology, Hillel's exegetical rules, midrashic techniques and patterns of interpretation, and literal interpretation. While the first two phenomena will be examined both in their Jewish background and in Luke's Gospel, the latter four will be dealt with in Judaism only to provide a background for my subsequent analysis of Jesus' use of these methods (Chapters 3 and 4). The examples cited mainly come from the rabbinic and Qumran documents, although there are some references from Philo.

Quotations and Allusions

Various ancient Jewish writings—such as the LXX, Targums, Mishnah, Tosefta, Gemaras, Talmuds, Midrashim, DSS, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and Philo—are devoted to the explanation and application of Scripture. Therefore, they are saturated with references, citations and allusions to the Hebrew Bible.[6]

Similarly, the NT writers employed the OT in several ways, most obviously by explicit citations and intentional allusions. Less apparently they were influenced by OT ideas, by OT idiom and possibly by LXX style.[7] This section will limit its discussion to explicit quotations

6. Because the ancient Jewish texts and commentaries are saturated with biblical quotations and allusions in their interpretation of Scripture, it is unnecessary to give further explanation and examples here. Yet several examples from the rabbinica, the DSS and Philo are given below in the discussion of other areas of Jewish interpretation. For definitions of the above bodies of literature, see J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), pp. 40-92. For an introduction to the diverse bodies of Jewish literature that are pertinent to NT studies, see esp. C.A. Evans, *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992); and more briefly Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 20-28. For studies devoted to the use and exegesis of Scripture in these texts see esp. Mulder (ed.), *Mikra*, and the works there cited. For a concise analysis of the ways the ancient Jewish scholars used Scripture, see, e.g., Moo, *Old Testament in Passion Narratives*, pp. 9-24, who discusses (1) linguistic influence, (2) quotations, (3) allusions, (4) structural style, (5) conceptual influence, and (6) summaries of OT history and teaching.

7. For discussions of the ways the NT used the OT, see, e.g., Ellis, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 147; Larkin, 'Holistic Description'; and *idem*,

and intentional allusions since they are the most frequent, easily observable, and less debated uses of the OT by the NT writers.

Explicit quotations are the most common OT usage in both Jewish and NT writings. A *quotation* may be defined as OT material preceded by an IF or an OT citation that lacks an IF, but that possesses a substantial verbatim agreement with an OT text (i.e., more than a brief phrase) or that is identified as a quotation by the NT context. The latter includes paraphrastic renderings that are intended to be more than mere allusions but that may not possess an exact verbal agreement with our LXX or MT because of such reasons as interpretive renderings of the text. An *allusion* is a more indirect reference that has some intended verbal or material parallelism to a specific OT text.

The distinction between quotations and allusions can be quite difficult and somewhat arbitrary.[8] Unfortunately the works that list the OT citations and allusions in the NT do not agree completely on definitions or on the identification of such references in Luke and the NT.[9] Even the editions of the two standard Greek texts do not agree. The UBS3 text lists 24 Lukan references as OT quotations and does not deal with allusions. The NA26 text italicizes 31 references as quotations and lists 525 allusions (inclusive of the 31 quotations). According to the above definitions, the excess of quotations in the NA26 text vis-à-vis the UBS3 text are better identified as allusions than intentional citations.[10] Thus, in our discussion the list of the 24

'Old Testament in Luke 22–23'. The latter writer is especially helpful in defining these usages and in the attention given to Luke. For the supposition of LXX style imitation see the section on the text form of quotations in ch. 1.

8. See Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, p. 57.

9. E.g., Holtz, *Zitate bei Lukas*, finds 21 explicit citations; Ringgren, 'Luke's Use', deals with 15; Barrett, 'Luke/Acts', limits citations to those with IF and sees 20; Swete, *Old Testament in Greek*, pp. 386-87, lists 17; L. Venard, 'Citations de l'ancien testaments dans le nouveau testament', *DBSup*, II. p. 23, has 17; Turpie, *Old Testament in New*, p. 276, deals with 21; Archer, *Quotations*, p. xx, classifies 30; Toy, *Quotations*, pp. 286-87, has 52; R.G. Bratcher (ed.), *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament* (New York: UBS, 3rd edn, 1987), pp. 17-24, distinguishes between quotations (15), allusions (25) and paraphrases (4); Dittmar, *Vetus Testamentum*, pp. 79-108, lists 248 OT references.

10. The NA26 text identifies 1.15; 7.22; 9.54; 12.35, 53; 13.19, 27; 21.26; 23.34 as quotations which the UBS3 text does not. These most likely are allusions because they do not have IF, do not appear to be intended as citations, and do not possess a substantial verbatim agreement with the OT. The UBS3 text classifies 8.10

citations in the UBS3 text and the 525 allusions in the NA26 text will be followed.

The quotations in Luke can be summarized as follows:

1. Three citations appear in Lukan editorial comments (2.23, 24; 3.4-6) while the remainder are by Jesus (4.4, 8, 12, 18-19; 7.27; 8.10; 13.35; 18.20; 19.46; 20.28, 37, 42-43; 21.27; 22.37, 69; 23.30, 46) or by those in conversation with him: Satan (4.10-11), a lawyer (10.27), a crowd (19.38), and some Sadducees (20.17).
2. While six are unique to Luke (2.23, 24; 4.18-19; 22.37; 23.30, 46), the remaining eighteen also appear in the double (4.4, 8, 10-11, 12; 13.35) or triple Synoptic tradition (3.4-6; 7.27; 8.10; 10.27; 18.20; 19.38, 46; 20.17, 28, 37, 42-43; 21.27; 22.69).
3. Lukan citations quote from ten OT books: Genesis (20.28), Exodus (2.23; 18.20; 20.37), Leviticus (2.24; 10.27), Deuteronomy (4.4, 8, 12; 10.27; 18.20; 20.28), Psalms (4.10-11; 13.35; 19.38; 20.17; 20.42-43; 22.69; 23.46), Isaiah (3.4-6; 4.18-19; 8.10; 19.46; 22.37), Jeremiah (19.46), Daniel (21.27), Hosea (23.30), and Malachi (7.27).
4. Four quotations merge or combine two OT texts to make a theological point (4.18-19; 10.27; 19.46; 20.28).
5. Eighteen citations have IF (2.23, 24; 3.4; 4.4, 8, 10, 12, 17; 7.27; 8.10; 10.26; 18.20; 19.46; 20.17, 28, 37, 42; 22.37).

The Gospel of Luke contains allusions to every OT book except the Song of Solomon, Obadiah and Zephaniah. It most frequently alludes to the Pentateuch, Isaiah and the Psalms and distributes the allusions as summarized below in Table 1. It makes some allusions that are almost quotations and others that are much more elusive and that may merely reflect the influence of OT phraseology on the expressions of Luke or his sources.

and 22.69 as citations; they seem to be intended as quotations although they are not italicized as such in the NA26 text. See Appendix A for a list of the OT quotations in both Greek texts along with the Synoptic parallels and an identification of the speakers. See Appendix B for the NA26 list of allusions.

Table 1. *The Old Testament Allusions in Luke*

Genesis	54	Ecclesiastes	1
Exodus	31	Song of Solomon	0
Leviticus	21	Isaiah	84
Numbers	6	Jeremiah	21
Deuteronomy	29	Lamentations	1
Joshua	1	Ezekiel	17
Judges	10	Daniel	27
Ruth	3	Hosea	8
1Samuel	18	Joel	2
2Samuel	13	Amos	3
1 Kings	18	Obadiah	0
2 Kings	11	Jonah	3
1 Chronicles	11	Micah	6
2 Chronicles	4	Nahum	1
Ezra	3	Habakkuk	3
Nehemiah	3	Zephaniah	0
Esther	1	Haggai	2
Job	8	Zechariah	6
Psalms	81	Malachi	6
Proverbs	8	*Total*	*525*

Introductory Formulas

In the Jewish expository literature, formulas that introduce citations[11] vary according to the subject matter, type of discourse, writer and source, but generally they employ verbs of 'saying' or 'writing'. They may be quite general (e.g., 'it is written'), or they may make specific references to God as the author, the human author, Scripture as a whole, a section of Scripture (e.g., 'the law'), or a particular book or story. They are primarily intended to inform the reader that the subsequent words either quote or refer to an OT text, but at times they may reflect the author's purpose and his view of Scripture. According to E.E. Ellis, the IF in the NT

11. For brief discussions on the IF in the NT and Jewish literature, see Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 79-82; *idem*, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', pp. 148-50; and *idem*, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1957), pp. 22-25, 48-49. Cf. D.M. Turpie, *The New Testament View of the Old* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1872), who devotes an entire volume to an analysis of all the IF in the NT.

> locate the 'Word of God' character of Scripture in the proper interpretation and application of its teaching... What 'is written', i.e. of divine authority, is not the biblical text in the abstract but the text in its meaningfulness for the current situation... The formulas, then, reveal not only a method of citation but also something of the theological convictions of the New Testament writers.[12]

The IF in the NT are similar to those appearing in the OT,[13] Philo,[14] the rabbinic writings and the DSS; yet they display certain differences because of their application to Christ.

Introductory Formulas in the Rabbis

The IF in rabbinic writings reflect methods of scriptural argumentation employed in first-century Judaism. Their IF most often use a verb of saying; the most frequent is a form of the verb אמר, generally in the *niphal* שנאמר (e.g., *Pe'ah* 8.9; *Ab.* 6.7), although דבר is sometimes employed (e.g., *Šab.* 4.7; *Sanh.* 4.4). They also used verbs of writing but with less frequency; כתב appears in the nominal and verbal forms to refer to Scripture (e.g., *Yeb.* 4.4; *Ab.* 6.10). Rarer IF are the *piel* of קום ('to establish', e.g., *Šeq.* 6.6), indefinite expressions (e.g., *Naz.* 9.5), and prepositions as IF (e.g., *Suk.* 13.9). At times their IF refer to an unnamed text (e.g., *Soṭ.* 5.3), to a portion of the OT, such as 'the law' (e.g., *Ab.* 6.7), or to a biblical figure or writer (e.g., *Yom.* 3.8). In contrast to the NT, the rabbinic formulas contain no fulfillment sayings.[15]

12. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 81-82.

13. E.g., 1 Kgs 2.27; 2 Chron. 35.12. See Ellis, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 148; and *idem*, *Paul's Use*, p. 48. Cf. R. Gordis, 'Quotations in Wisdom Literature', *JQR* 30 (1939–40), pp. 123-47; *idem*, 'Quotations as Literary Usage in Biblical, Oriental and Rabbinic Literature', *HUCA* 22 (1949), pp. 157-219, who investigates the problems of identifying citations in the OT; and M.V. Fox, 'The Identification of Quotations in Biblical Literature', *ZAW* 92 (1980), pp. 416-34, who replies to Gordis.

14. E.g., *Agr.* 50; *Somn.* 2.172; *Poster. C.* 12; *Gig.* 6. See Ellis, *Paul's Use*, p. 24, the literature there cited; and H.E. Ryle, *Philo, and Holy Scripture* (New York: Macmillan, 1895), pp. xlv-xlvi. For studies of biblical exegesis in Philo, see Y. Amir, 'Authority and Interpretation of Scripture in the Writings of Philo', in Mulder (ed.), *Mikra*, pp. 421-53, and the works there cited.

15. The above discussion is drawn from B.M. Metzger, 'The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah', *JBL* 70 (1951), pp. 297-307, who provides the only comprehensive comparison of the IF in these two bodies of literature. He lists, discusses and compares all the IF and offers the

Introductory Formulas in the DSS

Formulas introducing citations were also prevalent in the Qumran scrolls; these are particularly relevant for NT studies as the scrolls antedate or are contemporary with the NT. Forty-four IF in the scrolls have been classified according to the main verb in the formula: (1) 'To write' (כתב) occurs in 8 IF (e.g., 1QS 8.14). (2) Three verbs of 'saying' appear 22 times: אמר (e.g., CD 7.8), דבר (e.g., CD 19.15), and הגיד (e.g., 1QM 10.1). (3) The 14 other IF neither use verbs of 'writing' or 'saying' (e.g., CD 3.21). The Qumran formulas may be indefinite (e.g., CD 7.8), refer to God as the author (e.g., CD 6.13), or name the human instrument (e.g., CD 6.7-8). At times quotations appear without IF (e.g., CD 6.3), and sometimes IF occur that do not introduce scriptural citations (e.g., CD 9.8-9). The Qumran IF have a greater diversity of forms than the rabbis but still prefer verbs of 'saying'. As in the rabbis, there is no equivalent to the NT fulfillment formula at Qumran; the fulfillment formula is unique to the NT due to the christological fulfillment of the OT (cf. CD 7.10-11; 19.7 that refer to future events).[16]

following conclusions: (1) The two works contain many similar and identical IF. (2) While the Mishnah primarily uses verbs of 'saying', the NT is more balanced between verbs of 'saying' and 'writing'. (3) The NT has a greater variety in IF. (4) Both show a high view of inspiration and (5) recognize the human instrument. (6) The NT fulfillment IF, which is due to Christ's fulfillment of the OT, is not paralleled in the Mishnah. Although the Mishnah was not put into writing until the end of the second century AD, he states that it is widely held to be the oral teaching of the Tannaim who arose at the beginning of the first century AD.

16. The above discussion is based on J.A. Fitzmyer, 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Literature and in the New Testament', *NTS* 7 (1961), pp. 297-305, who studies all the IF at Qumran except those in the *pesharim* due to its lack of a strict parallel with the NT and 4QTestim which he has studied in another article (*idem*, '"4Q Testimonia" and the New Testament', *TS* 18 [1957], pp. 513-37). In this essay he compares the IF in the NT with those in the DSS and finds the NT's IF to be closer to Qumran's IF than the Mishnah's. Cf. F.L. Horton, Jr, 'Formulas of Introduction in the Qumran Literature', *RevQ* (1971), pp. 505-14; and M. Burrows, 'The Meaning of 'SR 'MR in DSH', *VT* 2 (1952), pp. 255-60. For a discussion on the formulas הוא פשר and, which may introduce biblical texts or an explanation following a citation, see the sections below on other exegetical methodology and on implicit midrash at Qumran.

Introductory Formulas in Luke's Gospel

In 18[17] of his 24 explicit citations Luke introduces them with formulas.[18] He employs γράφω 12 times (2.23; 3.4; 4.4, 8, 10, 17; 7.27; 10.26; 19.46; 20.17, 28; 22.37), λέγω 4 times (2.24; 4.12; 20.37, 42), and οἶδα once (18.20). Sometimes he combines these key verbs with other verbs (10.26: γέγραπται... ἀναγινώσκεις;[19] 22.37: γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι). Although God never appears as the speaker in his IF, Luke twice speaks of 'the law of the Lord' (2.23, 24). He locates several OT texts according to (1) the specific book or writer: Isaiah (3.4; 4.17), Moses (20.28; cf. 20.37), 'David...in Psalms' (20.42), (2) 'the law' (2.23, 24; 10.26) or 'the commandments' (18.20), and (3) an account ('Moses showed at the bush', 20.37). Three appear in Lukan editorial comments (2.23, 24; 3.4), one by Satan (4.10) and one by the Sadducees (20.28), the remaining thirteen by Jesus (4.4, 8, 12, 17;[20] 7.27; 8.10; 10.26; 18.20; 19.46; 20.17, 37, 42; 22.37).[21]

Nineteen other IF and terms for Scripture (14 of which are without Synoptic parallel) that do not actually introduce OT citations occur in

17. If 8.10's ἵνα is counted as an IF, there are eighteen.

18. See Appendix C for a complete list of the IF preceding OT quotations in Luke's Gospel.

19. The formula 'have you not read?' is found in the NT only on Jesus' lips. It usually appears in Jesus' debates with his religious opponents. Although it is found several times in Matthew and Mark (Mt. 12.3, 5; 19.4; 21.16, 42; 22.31; Mk 2.25; 12.10, 26), in Luke it only occurs in 6.3 in allusion to 1 Sam. 21.1-6. However, two similar, but implicit, instances of it occur in Lk. 10.26 ('What is written in the law? How do you read it?) and in 4.16, 21 ('He stood up to read..."Today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing."'). As in the rabbinic writings (e.g., *y. Ber.* 4d), it may imply the opponent has read but not understood the text. See Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 79-80; *idem*, 'How the New Testament Use the Old', p. 149; and D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: Athlone Press, 1956), pp. 432-33.

20. The IF of 4.17 occurs in narrative form preceding a quotation of Isa. 61.1-2; 58.6 by Jesus.

21. For a discussion on the IF attributed to Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, see Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, p. 60, who states that 'the presence or absence of such formulae and the differences in wording between them—except for the fulfillment formulae...signal little if anything of consequence, and they were evidently employed principally for stylistic and literary reasons, whether strictly dominical in their present forms or having been shaped to some extent by the Evangelists'. Yet see the comment by Ellis in n. 12 above.

Luke.[22] Yet several of these either precede (2.22) or follow quotations (2.27, 39; 4.21; 22.37) that already have IF or appear in narratives where the Scriptures are discussed (esp. 24.13-49). These formulas vary more in the verbs employed and terms for Scripture than Luke's actual IF discussed above. They employ 9 different verbs: εἶπεν (11.49) λαλέω (24.25), γράφω (21.22; 24.46), τελέω (2.39; 18.31), ἔχω τέλος (22.37), πληρόω (4.21; 21.22; 24.44); ἀναγινώσκω (6.3), διερμηνεύω (24.27), and διανοίγω (24.32; cf. 24.45).[23] They designate the OT in part or in its entirety as follows:

1. The Scripture(s) (4.21; 24.32, 45)
2. All things written (21.22)
3. The law as a reference to the whole OT (16.17), the law of Moses (2.22), the law of the Lord (2.27, 39)
4. The prophets (18.31; 24.25)
5. The law and the prophets (16.16); Moses and the prophets (16.29, 31; 24.27)
6. The law of Moses, the prophets, and the Psalms (24.44)

Three of these sayings appear in Lukan editorial comments (2.22, 27, 39), one is given by the Emmaus road disciples (24.32), and the remaining 15 are on the lips of Jesus (4.21; 6.3; 11.49; 16.16, 17, 29, 31; 18.31; 21.22; 22.37; 24.25, 27, 44, 45, 46).[24]

When Luke's IF are compared with the parallels in Matthew and Mark, generally they are similar or identical, but sometimes all three are different (e.g., 20.17, 42). Although Luke has no true parallel to

22. See Appendix D for a complete list of the IF and terms for Scripture appearing without OT quotations in Luke's Gospel.

23. For discussions of the verbs (esp. συζητέω, διανοίγω, διερμηνεύω) used for scriptural interpretation in Lk. 24 see B.J. Koet, 'Some traces of a Semantic Field of Interpretation in Luke 24,13-35', *Bijdragen* 46 (1985), pp. 58-73. Cf. G. Delling, '"...als er uns die Schrift aufschloss"', in H. Balz and S. Schulz (eds.), *Das Wort und die Wörter* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973), pp. 75-83.

24. Included here is the somewhat enigmatic ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν (11.49) that introduces a quotation from no known book (cf. the Mt. 23.34 parallel that puts the saying directly on the lips of Jesus without the IF). For discussions on its meaning, see esp. I.H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), pp. 502-504, and the literature there cited for the major views; Ellis, *Luke*, pp. 171-74; and *idem*, 'Luke xi.49-51', for the possibility of an adaptation of the saying by a Christian prophet. These scholars argue that the saying is a reference to divine wisdom, i.e., wisdom personified as God.

Matthew and John's fulfillment formula (ἵνα πληρωθῇ),[25] the IF before the unique saying in 22.37 (ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί) has the same force, and some of his IF appearing after or without quotations have similar weight (4.21; 18.31; 21.22; 22.37; 24.44).

When Luke's Gospel is compared with the works of Qumran and the rabbis, it is found to possess some similar and identical IF as can be seen in Tables 2 and 3 below.[26] It has more parallels to the Qumran materials than to the rabbis, and in agreement with them it recognizes both the OT as the word of God and the instrumentality of the human author. In contrast to the rabbis and Qumran, Luke prefers γράφω (12 times) over λέγω (4 times), and has some fulfillment formulas that are absent in both sets of writings.

Table 2. *A Representative Comparison of IF in the Mishnah and in Luke*

Pes. 6.2	מה־שכתוב בתורה	Lk. 2.23	καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου ὅτι
Yom. 1.1	שנאמר	Lk. 4.12	ὅτι εἴρηται
'Abod Zar. 2.5	היאך אתה קורא	Lk. 10.26	ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις;
Ab. 6.10	דכתיב	Lk. 20.17	τί οὖν ἐστιν τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦτο
Ab. 6.9	נכן כתוב בספר תהלים על ידי דוד מלך ישראל	Lk. 20.42	αὐτὸς γὰρ Δαυὶδ λέγει ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν

25. For a study of πληρόω in the Bible and the ancient Jewish literature, see C.F.D. Moule, 'Fulfillment-Words in the New Testament', *NTS* 14 (1968), pp. 293-320. In Luke he lists the most important usages as 1.20; 4.21; 9.31; 21.24; 22.16; 24.44 and less relevant ones as 2.40; 3.5; 7.1; 8.23; 9.51. He thinks that the use of this verb in the NT, especially the Gospels, is due to Jesus' own employment of the term and argues that it is to be understood in the sense of covenant promise and fulfillment in the Christ event.

26. The material appearing in these tables was adapted from the more comprehensive studies of Metzger, 'The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah', pp. 297-307; and Fitzmyer, 'Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Literature', pp. 297-305.

Table 3. *A Representative Comparison of IF in the Qumran Scrolls and in Luke*

4QFlor 1.2	כאשר כתוב בספר מושה	Lk. 2.23	καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου ὅτι
CD 11.20	כי כתוב	Lk. 4.10	γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι
4QFlor 1.15	אשר כתוב בספר ישעיה הנביא לאחרית הימים	Lk. 3.4	ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ λόγων Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου
CD 7.8	כאשר אמר	Lk. 2.24	κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου
CD 5.1	כתוב	Lk. 4.4, 8; 19.46	γέγραπται ὅτι
CD 10.16	כי הוא אשר אמר	Lk. 7.27	οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται

Other Exegetical Terminology

Besides the IF other exegetical terminology appears in the ancient Jewish expositions of Scripture with parallels in the NT, such as 'this is' (οὗτος ἐστίν), 'but' (ἀλλά, δέ), 'learn' (μανθάνω) and 'hear' (ἀκούω).[27]

1. In the LXX οὗτος ἐστίν renders Semitic terms that are employed as formulas (i.e., 'this is...') to introduce interpretations of divine revelation given through oracles (הוא, Isa. 9.14-15), parables (זאת, Ezek. 5.5), visions (זאת, Zech. 1.10, 19; 5.3, 6), dreams (פשרא, Dan. 4.24 [21]), and enigmatic writing (פשר, Dan. 5.25-26). For example,

> The Lord will cut off from Israel head and tail... the elder and the honored man, this is (הוא) the head, and the prophet who teaches lies, this is (הוא) the tail (Isa. 9.14-15).

In Daniel and the Qumran scrolls these formulas were used in a similar manner with, or as an equivalent of, the *pesher* formula (פשר, 'the interpretation is...'). But in distinction to Daniel, at Qumran the formula was employed to serve its eschatological mindset and resulting exegesis.[28] For example,

27. This section is based on Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 82-87, who also cites NT examples which are excluded here. See also the extensive discussion of rabbinic terms in W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1889–1905).

28. For further detail on biblical exposition at Qumran and works that deal with

> 'Because of bloodshed in the city and violence done against the land' [Hab. 2.17b], the interpretation is [פשרו]: The 'city', that is [היא] Jerusalem where the wicked priest committed his abominable works and where he defiled the sanctuary of God; 'violence done against the land' these are [המה] the cities of Judah where he robbed the poor of their possessions (1QpHab 12.6-10)

2. The rabbis used the adversative 'but' as an exegetical term to resolve apparent contradictions in Scripture and to specify the meaning of Scripture.[29] For example,

> All shofars are valid save of a cow, since it is a horn. But are not (והלא) all shofars called... 'horn'? For it is written, 'When they... blast with the rams's horn' (Jos. 6.5)... 'When Moses held up his hand, Israel prevailed' (Exod. 17.11). But (וכי) could the hands of Moses promote the battle? (*m. Roš Haš.* 3.2, 8).

3. The terms 'learn' (למד)[30] and 'hear' (שמע) were used in rabbinic formulas to join texts and commentary with reference to understanding Scripture. For example,

> Behold we have learned [(למד) from the preceding exposition] that work is forbidden during the days of the festival (*Mek. Pisha* 9 on Exod. 12.16).

> 'She shall go out for nothing'. I might understand [שמע] 'for nothing' to mean without a bill of divorce (*Mek. Nez.* 3 on Exod. 21.11).

Hillel's Exegetical Rules

Seven exegetical rules, known as the *middoth* in the rabbinic literature, were attributed by later rabbinic tradition to the famous rabbi Hillel whose teaching antedated Jesus by a generation or more.[31] As

this formula at Qumran and the rabbinic writings see the section on implicit midrash at Qumran below.

29. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 85, also notices that sometimes a contrast between Scripture and Scripture or Scripture and commentary is found in the rabbis even without the employment of 'but'.

30. 'Learn' (μανθάνω) does not appear in Luke.

31. D. Daube, 'Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric', *HUCA* 22 (1949), pp. 239-64; and *idem*, 'Alexandrian Methods of Interpretation and the Rabbis', in M. Gerwig *et al.* (eds.), *Festschrift Hans Lewald* (Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1953), pp. 27-44, argues that Hillel derived his rules from the Hellenistic rhetoric prevalent at Alexandria since he studied under Shemaiah and

general hermeneutical principles, they made use of inference, analogy[32] from other verses, and context.[33] They were used to show the basis of the oral law in the written law and to make Scripture apply to all life's situations. These rules may be listed as follows:

1. *Qal wahomer* (קל וחומר = 'light and heavy'): An inference drawn from a minor premise to a major premise and vice versa.
2. *Gezerah shawah* (גזירה שוה = 'an equivalent regulation'): An inference drawn from an analogy of expressions, that is from similar words and phrases elsewhere.
3. *Binyan 'ab mikatub 'ehad* (בנין אב מכתוב אחד = 'constructing a leading rule from one passage'): A general principle established on the basis of a teaching contained in one verse.
4. *Binyan 'ab mishene ketubim* (בנין אב משני כתובים 'constructing a leading rule from two passages'): A general principle established on the basis of a teaching contained in two verses.

Abtalion, proselytes from Hellenism. Yet Daube admits that the rabbis who adopted these methods 'Hebraized' them. Similarly, M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (trans. J. Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), I, p. 84, and the literature there cited. Otherwise: e.g., Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, p. 60, objects that Daube's view 'is hardly susceptible of a well-founded answer, since we are in the dark as to the condition of scriptural exegesis before that time'. Similarly, S. Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1950), p. 54, examines the Greek parallels but finds no definite Greek influence on the *middoth.* Cf. S. Zeitlin, 'Hillel and the Hermeneutic Rules', *JQR* 54 (1963), pp. 161-73, who argues against the view that Hillel introduced the *middoth* and that they were influenced by Hellenism; in turn, he alleges that the rabbinic passages which attribute the *middoth* to him are later interpolations.

32. See W.S. Towner, 'Hermeneutical Systems of Hillel and the Tannaim', *HUCA* 53 (1982), p. 112, who claims that the basis of most of the *middoth* is comparability: 'established by terminology, juxtaposition, positioning in a hierarchy of institutions, or simple syntax'.

33. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, p. 89, says, 'It is evident that we cannot share the exegesis of the Tannaites. But that must not prevent us from realizing that it is a really systematic exegesis, and certainly not an ingenious playing upon the text'. Similarly, Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, p. 35, writes, 'Obviously, some of these rules are a matter of common sense and sound judgment, while others are pregnant with possibilities for abuse... But with these *middoth* of Hillel the distinctive exegetical features of Pharisaic Judaism come clearly into view.'

5. *Kelal uperat uperat ukelal* (כלל ופרט ופרט וכלל = 'general and particular, particular and general'): An inference drawn from a general principle in the text to a specific example and vice versa.
6. *Kayose' bo mimaqom 'aher* (כיוצא בו ממקום אחר = 'something similar in another passage'): An inference drawn from an analogous passage elsewhere.
7. *Dabar halamed me'inyano* (דבר הלמד מענינו = 'explanation from context'): An interpretation of a word or passage from its context.[34]

The following are examples of the seven rules as applied by the Tannaitic rabbis in *Mekilta deRabbi Ishmael*.[35]

> From this I know only with respect to a holiday that you are warned against the work of your fellow-Jew as you are against your own. How about the Sabbath? It can be reasoned by using the method of *Kal vahomer*: If on a holiday in regard to which the law is not so rigorous, you are warned against the work of your fellow-Jew as you are against your own work, it is but logical to assume that on the Sabbath in regard to which the law is more rigorous, you surely are warned against the work of your fellow-Jew as you are against your own work [Rule 1 from *Pisha* 9.48-52 on Exod. 12.16].
>
> Scripture says: 'If thy brother, a Hebrew man...be sold unto thee' (Deut. 15.12). Now, after having said: 'Thy brother', there seems to be no purpose in saying: 'A Hebrew man'. Why then does the Scripture say: 'A Hebrew man'? Merely to furnish an expression free to be used in formulating the following *Gezerah shavah*: Here the expression 'Hebrew' is

34. The *middoth* are listed in *ARN* 37; *t. Sanh.* 7.11; and the introduction to *Sifra* 3a. For lists, discussion, and illustrations of Hillel's rules in the secondary literature, see, Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 87-91; Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 32-38; Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, pp. 66-75; G.F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1930), III, p. 73; Bowker, *Targums*, pp. 315-18; and Towner, 'Hermeneutical Systems', pp. 101-35. For lists and discussion of all three sets of the *middoth* and other rules see H.L. Strack, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1931), pp. 93-98; R. Kasher, 'The Interpretation of Scripture in Rabbinic Literature', in Mulder (ed.), *Mikra*, pp. 584-94, and the works he cites.

35. The examples in this section are as cited in Towner, 'Hermeneutical Systems', pp. 112-25, which has a detailed discussion of the rules and further Tannaitic examples.

used and there the expression 'Hebrew' is used. Just as there when using the expression 'Hebrew' Scripture deals with an Israelite, so also when using the expression 'Hebrew' (lit., 'Hebrew slave') Scripture deals with an Israelite [Rule 2 from *Nez.* 1.35-40 on Exod. 21.2].

Let me establish a general rule on the basis of what is common to all these instances: The peculiar aspect of the duty of circumcision [Exod. 12.48] is not like the peculiar aspect of the duty of study [Exod. 13.8, 14-15], and the peculiar aspect of the duty of study is not like the peculiar aspect of the duty of circumcision. Neither have both of them the same peculiar aspect as the duty of redemption [Exod. 13.13], nor has the duty of redemption the peculiar aspect of either. What is common to all three of them is that each is a religious duty affecting the son which should be performed by the father. And if the father does not perform it, the son himself must do it. So also any religious duty affecting the son which should be performed by the father must be performed by the son himself if the father fails to do it [Rule 4 from *Pisha* 18.104-11 on Exod. 13.13].[36]

'This is the ordinance of the passover', is a general statement. 'There shall be no alien eat thereof', is a particular statement. When a general statement is followed by a particular, it does not include more than is contained in the particular [Rule 5 from *Pisha* 15.7-8 on Exod. 12.43].

In like manner you interpret: 'And the priest shall kindle wood on it [i.e., the altar]', etc. (Lev. 6.5). Why has this been commanded? Has it not been said: 'And Lebanon is not sufficient for fuel' (Isa. 40.16)? What then is the purport of the commandment: 'And the priest shall kindle wood on it?' Merely to enable you to receive reward for fulfilling it [Deut. 15.19; Rule 6 from *Pisha* 16.38-41].[37]

'Our Rabbis taught' *Thou shalt not steal* (Exod. 20.13)... You say Scripture refers to the stealing of human beings, but perhaps it is not so, the theft of property being meant?—I will tell you: Go forth and learn from the 13 principles whereby the torah is interpreted, a law is interpreted by its general context: of what does the text speak? of [crimes involving] capital punishment; hence this too refers [to a crime involving] capital punishment [Rule 7 from *b. Sanh.* 86a].

36. Although the third and fourth rules are listed as two separate rules, the fourth is merely an extension of the third (cf. the later thirteen rules of R. Ishmael that treats it as one rule). Thus, only an example of rule four is given here.

37. Perhaps a clearer example of this rule appears in *Mek. Pisha* 1 on Exod. 12.1. 'Honor your father and your mother' (Exod. 20.12) might be seen to give precedence to the father because he is mentioned first. However, in an analogous passage, 'mother' precedes 'father' (Lev. 19.3) which shows by analogy that both are to be honored equally. See Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 88.

After the close of the NT era, Hillel's rules were expanded to 13 by Ishmael (AD 110–30) and 32 by Eliezer ben Jose the Galilean (AD 130–60).[38] Each of the latter two sets incorporated and extended the former ones.[39] The new principles found in Eliezer's 32 rules were much less conservative than Hillel's rules and often brought about fanciful treatments of Scripture through an atomistic exegesis and through a disregard for the linguistic and historical contexts.[40] For example, by *gematria* the numeric value of letters was computed and secret alphabets or substitution of letters for other letters were employed; by *notrikon* a word was broken into several words and its single letters expounded as words.

Hillel's exegetical rules, which were the essence of Pharisaic exegesis in Jesus' day, are often discussed under the category of midrash.[41] Although they have been treated prior to our discussion on midrash, they relate to this theme and thereby provide a fitting transition to our discussion of midrash.

Midrashic Interpretation

Definition of Midrash

The term midrash is derived from the cognate substantive form מדרש (*midrash*) of the Hebrew verb דרש (*darash*). In its general sense it means 'search', but in the ancient Jewish literature it most often was used with the specific meaning of studying, interpreting, and commenting on the Scriptures. It has retained the latter technical meaning

38. These are not listed or discussed since they postdate the NT period and therefore are not crucial to this study.

39. E.g., (1) Hillel's sixth rule was omitted by Ishmael and its function assumed under Ishmael's third and fourth rules. (2) The fifth rule was divided into three rules, and five modifications of the general and particular are added. (3) The thirteenth rule is completely new; it basically states that two texts may contradict each other until a third text harmonizes them (e.g., *Mek. Pisha* 4.42-49).

40. Moore, *Judaism*, I, p. 248, has a classic statement on this point; he characterizes the thirty-two rules to have produced 'an atomistic exegesis, which interprets sentences, clauses, phrases, and even single words, independently of the context or the historical occasion, as divine oracles; combines them with other similarly detached utterances; and makes use of analogy of expressions, often by purely verbal association'.

41. See, e.g., Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, pp. 65-90; and Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 32-38.

as an exegetical term to this day. Thus, midrash may be briefly defined as biblical commentary or exposition that is grounded in the presuppositions and methods of ancient Judaism.[42]

The noun מדרש only occurs twice in the Hebrew OT where it likely refers to commentary on the Scriptures (2 Chron. 13.22; 24.27); similarly, the more frequent verb דרש also was used of biblical interpretation (Ezra 7.10). Besides the OT usages, midrash was used in pre-Christian Judaism for scriptural interpretation.[43] Notable early examples are Ben Sira's 'house of midrash' (51.23), a reference to a place of Torah instruction, and Qumran's use of the term for the study of the law (1QS 8.15, 26; CD 20.6). In later rabbinic literature the term retained the same essential meaning (e.g., *Gen. R.* 42.1). As is evident from the NT, the interpretation and study of Scripture (i.e., midrash) was common in first-century Judaism's synagogues (e.g., Lk. 4.16-30) and academic schools (e.g., Acts 22.3).[44]

Since the 1950s scholars specialized in Jewish and NT studies have engaged in a lively debate on the proper definition of the term midrash. Due to this controversy M. McNamara has recently exclaimed that we are at an impasse in an understanding of the term,[45]

42. For essays devoted to extensive word studies on 'midrash' and related terms in the OT and in the rabbis, see M. Gertner, 'Terms of Scriptural Interpretation', *BSOAS* 25 (1962), pp. 1-27; and S. Zeitlin, 'Midrash', *JQR* 44 (1953), pp. 21-36. Cf. C.A. Evans, 'Midrash', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 544-48, who furnishes a recent, concise discussion on the definition of midrash and the use of midrash by the rabbis, Jesus and the Gospel writers.

43. The noun 'midrash' (מדרש) appears in 2 Chron. 13.22; 24.27; Sir. 51.23; 1QS 6.24; 8.15, 26; CD 20.6; 4QFlor 1.14.

44. See esp. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 91-101; and R. Bloch, 'Midrash', in W.S. Green (ed.), *Approaches to Judaism* (trans. M.H. Callaway; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978 [1957]), pp. 29-50, who discuss the meaning and practice of midrash in the Bible and Jewish literature and interact with the major works on the subject.

45. M. McNamara, 'Some Issues and Recent Writings on Judaism and the New Testament', *IBS* 9 (1978), pp. 131-50, says, 'There is no doubt but that we have reached something of an impasse at the present moment with regard to the understanding of the term "midrash", and regarding its presence in the New Testament writings. All this has in part arisen from the extension of the use of the term in Hebrew or Jewish literature to the New Testament'. For further essays devoted to the discussion of this debate, see, e.g., R. Le Déaut, 'Apropos a Definition of Midrash', *Int* 25 (1971), pp. 259-82; and M.P. Miller, 'Targum, Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament', *JSJ* 2 (1971), pp. 29-82.

and J. Neusner has even forsaken using it in a book on midrash that has 'midrash' in its title.[46]

R. Bloch, the pioneer of the modern study of midrash and of its application to the NT, and those who have built on her work favor a broad definition of midrash that encompasses both an interpretive activity and its product, a literary genre. These scholars have found the presence of midrash in the rabbinica, the Hebrew Bible, the LXX, Targums, most NT books, and other ancient Jewish works, such as the DSS and Philo.[47] Opponents of the broad usage admit that midrash encompasses both an activity and a genre, but they insist on a narrow definition that limits the term to a literary genre associated with certain rabbinic commentaries.[48] However, most scholars hold to the broad definition since in ancient Judaism midrash designated both an exegetical activity and a literary genre.[49]

46. J. Neusner, *Midrash in Context* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), pp. xvi-xvii, discusses a threefold usage of 'midrash' (a literary genre, the activity of exegesis, and a particular kind of hermeneutics), but he still opposes the use of the term.

47. Bloch, 'Midrash', pp. 29-50, built on A. Robert, 'Littéraires (Genres)', *DBSup*, V, pp. 406-21, who was the first to contend that the roots of midrash, what he termed 'procédé anthologique', are found in post-exilic OT books; i.e., OT writers used and reinterpreted older passages to contemporize and reapply them to the present situation (e.g., cf. Jer. 32.18 with Exod. 20.5-6; Dan. 11.30 with Num. 24.24; Jer. 7.21-22 with Amos 5.25-26; Jer. 48.45 with Num. 21.28; 24.17). Bloch's work has been extended by G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1961). For other proponents of the broad definition, see, e.g., Le Déaut, 'Apropos', pp. 259-82; Gertner, 'Terms'; Zeitlin, 'Midrash'; Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 68-70, 91-101; *idem*, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', pp. 151-62; and Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, pp. 52-55.

48. E.g., A.G. Wright, *The Literary Genre Midrash* (Staten Island: Society of St Paul, 1967); G.G. Porton, 'Defining Midrash', in J. Neusner (ed.), *The Study of Ancient Judaism* (New York: Ktav, 1981), I, pp. 55-92; G.G. Porten, *Understanding Rabbinic Midrash* (Hoboken: Ktav, 1985); followed by J. Neusner, *Midrash in Context*; and *idem*, *What is Midrash?* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987). Cf. Alexander, 'Midrash', pp. 1-18, who holds to the broad definition, but he insists the term must be limited to rabbinic materials and is not to be used of the NT; followed by McNamara, 'Some Issues', pp. 131-50.

49. A less common, recent usage that will not be dealt with here is the hypothesis that the Gospel writers created some of their NT narratives from ideas found in famous OT stories by an imaginative literary process that some writers call 'midrash'. See Chapter 1's section on midrash as narrative creation where it was discussed and shown to be invalid by several scholars.

As an exegetical activity, according to R. Bloch, midrash, has its basis in Scripture, is homiletical in nature, and seeks to adapt Scripture to the present situation for purposes of explanation and application. Also, it is classified into two types: *haggadah*, that which deals with non-legal narrative portions of Scripture applied for the purpose of edification and comfort and *halakah*, that which concerns legal parts of the OT used for rules of conduct.[50]

As a literary expression, E.E. Ellis has distinguished between implicit midrash (i.e., interpretive renderings of the biblical text) and explicit midrash (i.e., various kinds of text plus commentary patterns).[51]

Implicit Midrash

In ancient Judaism implicit midrash is prevalent in the Hebrew Bible, in its early translations, the LXX and Targums, and in other writings, such as the Qumran scrolls. It occurred in these texts as a rewriting, transposition, and sometimes even an alteration of previous traditions which were done for purposes of explanation and application.

50. This list is based on Bloch, 'Midrash', pp. 31-34; I have combined her points 1 and 3 ('Its Point of Departure is Scripture' and 'It is a Study which is Attentive to the Text') due to their similarity. She says that the present adaptation 'along with its close relation and constant reference to Scripture, is the essence of midrash... This tendency to actualize corresponds to the way in which Israel—and later the church—has always understood Scripture as the word of God. It always involves a living Word addressed personally to the people of God and to each of its members.' Similarly, G. Vermes, 'Bible and Midrash', in *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), pp. 59-91, claims that the practice of midrash arose to meet the needs of life's present situations and classifies midrash into the two types of exegesis that arose to meet the needs of post-biblical Jews: 'pure' (that which deals with problems in the Hebrew text) and 'applied' (that which gives biblical answers to nonbiblical problems). Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, p. 55, writes that 'the application to the present determines the explanation of Scripture in the Jewish religion... [This] explanation of Scripture is called *Midrash*.' Cf. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 91-92; and *idem*, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 151.

51. Ellis first drew this distinction in 'Midrash', pp. 188-97; and developed it in subsequent essays, e.g., *idem*, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old'; and *idem*, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 91-101. He built on M. Gertner, 'Midrashim in the New Testament', *JSS* 7 (1962), pp. 267-70, who spoke of covert (invisible) and overt (visible) midrash in the NT. They also claim that implicit midrash in the NT is sometimes the result of an explicit midrash (i.e., text plus commentary) becoming disassembled in transmission and leaving only commentary.

Implicit Midrash in the Old Testament Versions. Implicit midrash first appears in the Hebrew OT as later biblical writers and prophets applied the laws and earlier traditions to the contemporary situations. This use of earlier biblical materials within the Hebrew Bible has been aptly called 'inner biblical exegesis' by M. Fishbane.[52]

That implicit midrash is present throughout the Hebrew Bible is evident from the following examples from each section of the OT:

1. In the Pentateuch Deuteronomy is a reworking and reapplication of the Exodus traditions (e.g., two versions of the decalogue appear in Exod. 20.2-17; Deut. 5.6-21).
2. In the historical books Chronicles is a reinterpretation of Samuel–Kings (e.g., cf. 2 Sam. 7.16 with 2 Chron. 17.14).
3. In the prophets the works frequently made use of the exodus, wilderness and covenant traditions (e.g., Isa. 19.19-22 used Exod. 1–12).
4. In the poetic and wisdom literature the books transposed earlier writings for encouragement and instruction (e.g., Ps. 132.11-12 used 2 Sam. 7.1-17, and Proverbs 1–9 employed the vocabulary from Deuteronomy, Jeremiah and Isaiah).[53]

The ancient translations of the Hebrew OT, the LXX and Targums, also contain implicit midrash. They combined interpretive alterations with the translation process in order to adapt the Scripture to their contemporary situations, a primary concern of both midrash and these

52. See M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985); and *idem*, 'Inner Biblical Exegesis', in G.H. Hartman and S. Budick (eds.), *Midrash and Literature* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), pp. 19-37, who examines this procedure in four areas: scribal comments and corrections, legal, haggadic, and mantological exegesis. Although he and others (e.g., Bloch, 'Midrash'; and Neusner, *What is Midrash?*) approach this issue from a tradition historical perspective that utilizes the classical documentary hypothesis, it is not necessary to assume this view in order to see later writers using the traditions of earlier books.

53. For further examples and the recent literature on this subject see part 1 of D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson (eds.), *It is Written* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 25-83, which contains several essays on the use of OT traditions in the OT. More briefly, Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 47-49, 92-96.

translations.[54] For example, in the LXX the translator of Isa. 9.11 replaced the Arameans and the Philistines of Isaiah's time with the Syrians and the Greeks of his own time. In *Targ. Isa.* 52.13–53.12 the writer transformed the suffering servant into the royal and conquering messiah.

Implicit Midrash at Qumran. Besides the presence of implicit midrash in the rewriting of certain biblical books in the Qumran scrolls (i.e., the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees),[55] a kind of midrashic exposition known as *pesher* midrash appears that has certain distinctions from rabbinic midrash (e.g., 1QpHab).[56] It is called a midrash in 4QFlor 1.14, 19,[57] and it occurs in three forms of commentary patterns: single OT quotations (e.g., CD 4.14), an anthology of texts (e.g., 4QFlor), and verse by verse commentary on OT books (e.g., 1QpHab).[58]

54. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, p. 179, calls the LXX and Targums a 'rewriting of the Bible' that combined contemporary interpretations in the translation of the Hebrew Bible. For recent introductions to the LXX and Targums and the midrashic elements in them, see E. Tov, 'The Septuagint'; and P.S. Alexander, 'Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scriptures', in Mulder (ed.), *Mikra*, pp. 161-88, 217-54, respectively, and the literature they cite. For studies devoted to the midrashic elements in the LXX and Targums, see, e.g., R. LeDéaut, 'Un phénomène spontané de herméneutique juive ancienne', *Bib* 52 (1971), pp. 505-25; and D.W. Gooding, 'On the Use of the LXX for Dating Midrashic Elements in the Targums', *JTS* 25 (1974), pp. 1-11. Cf. Bloch, 'Midrash', pp. 46-48; Ellis, 'Midrash', pp. 188-89; and *idem*, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 92-96.

55. Qumran's Genesis Apocryphon and *Jubilees*, which are rewritings of Genesis, are examples of implicit midrash on a more extreme scale than that in the Hebrew Bible or its translations. Interpretive alterations present in many Qumran texts, which are discussed below, also are examples of implicit midrash. See Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 93.

56. W.H. Brownlee, 'The Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan', *JJS* 7 (1956), pp. 169-86, states that he coined the phrase *Midrash Pesher* in a paper given at Duke Divinity School ('The Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum Jonathan' [1953], p. 12).

57. At Qumran these terms only appear in relation to one another in 4QFlor 1.14, 19: 'Explanation of [מדרש] "How Blessed is the man who does not walk in the counsel of the wicked" [Ps. 1.1]. The interpretation is [פשר]...' For a detailed study of 4QFlor 1.14, 19, see G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), pp. 38, 92-93, 149-56.

58. There are eighteen documents from Qumran that are continuous commentaries

The Qumran expositions and exegetical methods received the designation *pesher* midrash due to the Aramaic term (פשר, meaning 'interpretation, solution') that is characteristically found in its expository formula, 'the interpretation (פשר) is...' This formula and its equivalent, 'this is' (הוא), sometimes introduce quotations (e.g., CD 10.16) but more frequently the subsequent commentary after the citation (e.g., 1QpHab 12.6-7; 4QFlor 1.11-14). Both formulas and their equivalents appear in the Hebrew Bible, the latter rendered by οὗτος [ἐστίν] in the LXX.[59]

The distinctive presuppositions of the Qumran sect are a further reason that their expositions have been given the designation *pesher* midrash rather than simply midrash like the rabbis.[60] These theological assumptions have caused certain distinctions in their techniques and have influenced their interpretations. Their unique axioms concern their conception of their community, revelation and interpretation; and they stem in part from their imminent, apocalyptic eschatology. They may be briefly summarized as follows.[61]

1. The sectarians saw themselves as the divinely elected community of the end days on the edge of the final consummation, a community with the task of preparing for the arrival of the messianic era. Since they saw themselves as God's eschatological people, they thought that certain OT prophecies exclusively concerned their situation.

2. They held that revelation was given in two stages: the *raz* (רז), a divine mystery communicated through the OT prophets, and the *pesher* (פשר), the inspired interpretation supplied by Qumran's teachers.

3. They thought that the prophet's words, especially the time of fulfillment, had a veiled, eschatological meaning that had been with-

on single books. They are called *pesharim* because of the presence of the interpretive formula using the word *pesher* (פשר). For a study of the texts and literary genre of the *pesharim*, see esp. M.P. Horgan, *Pesharim* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1979).

59. See the section above on exegetical terminology for additional detail and examples of this formula from the OT and the DSS.

60. For studies of the theological presuppositions of ancient Judaism, see n. 5.

61. For additional detail, see, e.g., F.F. Bruce, 'Biblical Exposition at Qumran', in France and Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives*, III, pp. 77-80; and *idem*, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959), pp. 7-27.

held from the OT prophets and that only the divinely inspired Qumran interpreters could unveil.

The sectarians' expositions shared several commonalties with the midrashic methods of the rabbis, but their exegesis primarily contained two distinctive elements that portray their uniqueness: the combination of Qumran *pesher* and rabbinic midrashic techniques, and the use and creation of textual variants for exegetical purposes.[62]

Qumran's Bible commentators combined their eschatological *raz* (mystery)-*pesher* (interpretation) revelational conception of biblical interpretation,[63] a conception unparalleled in the rabbis, with rabbinic methods. Thus, they produced expositions that may be described as a revelatory exegesis, a combination of revelation and midrashic techniques.[64] In their writings they most explicitly illustrated this

62. W.H. Brownlee, 'Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *BA* 14 (1951), pp. 54-76, lists thirteen 'propositions' of the DSS and argues that they are essentially rabbinic (i.e., midrashic) in character. While his final eleven points are practices paralleled in rabbinic midrash, his first two points certainly are to be distinguished from rabbinic midrash: (1) 'Everything the ancient prophet wrote has a *veiled eschatological meaning*.' Although both sought to contemporize the Scripture, only Qumran interpreted Scripture in light of her imminent apocalyptic fulfillment. (2) 'Since the ancient prophet wrote cryptically, his meaning is often to be ascertained through a *forced or abnormal construction of the Biblical text*.' This refers to deliberate alterations of the OT text for exegetical purposes, a practice frequent at Qumran but rare in the rabbis (see n. 71). My discussion in this section will focus on these two elements. Similarly, Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 38-45, bases much of his section on these two points. For further studies of Qumran's exegesis in relation to the rabbis, see the works cited in nn. 64, 70.

63. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, p. 41, calls this concept 'the *raz* (mystery)-*pesher* (interpretation) revelational motif'. Cf. Bruce, 'Biblical Exposition', p. 78, who writes, 'According to the Qumran commentators, then, God conveyed his purpose to the prophets in the form of a "mystery". No one can understand this mystery unless its interpretation has been given to him. The interpretation depended on direct revelation from God as truly the mystery had done. The Qumran commentators gave the impression that no one before their day had understood the prophets; they were able to understand them because the interpretive key was at their disposal.'

64. See. e.g., M. Fishbane, 'Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran', in Mulder (ed.), *Mikra*, pp. 342-77, who similarly describes Qumran's view of biblical interpretation: 'The true application of the laws... [and] prophecies is the product of techniques and meanings revealed to the Teacher of Righteousness and his followers'. Because of their distinctive view of continuing revelation, he describes their method as '*exegetical revelations*'. Similarly, K.G. Friebel, 'Biblical Interpretation of the *Pesharim* of the Qumran Community', *Hebrew Studies* 22

raz-pesher motif in an exposition of Hab. 2.1-3 in 1QpHab 7.1-8:

> And God told Habakkuk to write down that which would happen to the final generation, but he did not make known to him when time would come to an end. And as for that which he said, 'that he who reads may read it speedily', the interpretation [ופשר] concerns the Teacher of Righteousness to whom God made known all the mysteries [רזי] of the words of his servants the prophets. 'For there shall be yet another vision concerning the appointed time. It shall tell of the end and shall not lie'. The interpretation [ופשר] means that the final age shall be prolonged and shall exceed all that the prophets have said; for the mysteries of God are astounding.

Although many midrashic methods practiced by the rabbis occur in the scrolls (e.g., wordplays and tallying of passages), the Qumran commentators did not appear to see themselves doing an exegesis like the rabbis. Rather they saw themselves giving an inspired interpretation of divine mysteries like Daniel's interpretation of dreams and visions.[65] Similar to Daniel, Qumran's teachers thought the *raz* was divinely given to one person (the ancient prophet) and its interpretation to another (an inspired teacher at Qumran). Yet they still employed several of the exegetical techniques found in the rabbis in arriving at these 'inspired' interpretations.[66]

(1981), pp. 13-24, focuses on the terms *raz* and *pesher* in discussing Qumran's presuppositions and principles of interpretation and concludes they used methods similar to the rabbinic midrashim but had a distinction in content. G. Vermes, 'The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in its Historical Setting', in *Post-biblical Jewish Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), pp. 37-49, compares the exegesis of Qumran and the rabbis and concludes that Qumran combined revelation and modified rabbinic methods. He categorizes the two main types of interpretation in the scrolls (1) as the adaptation of biblical laws and (2) as the reinterpretation of prophecies in application to themselves. See also nn. 66, 70.

65. In the Aramaic portion of Daniel (2.4–7.28) פשר occurs thirty times, each referring to the prophetic interpretation of dreams or visions. Cf. Gen. 40–41 which uses the Hebrew cognates of פשר for Joseph's interpretation of the dreams.

66. A. Finkel, 'The Pesher of Dreams and Scriptures', *RevQ* 4 (1963), pp. 357-70, discusses the uses and characteristics of the *pesher* interpretation in the OT, Qumran scrolls and rabbinic literature. He concludes, 'The method of applying pesher to the Scriptures indicates traditional lines of interpretation in Qumran and rabbinic sources. The central feature is the understanding of the inspired words of the past in the context of the present or future situation, or relating them to a given case. To achieve these purposes the exegete allegorically interprets the significant words. He further employs dual-reading, dual meaning of a word and word-splitting to

E.E. Ellis characterizes this trait, which is distinct from the rabbis, as a charismatic and eschatological exegesis. As a charismatic exegesis, it saw biblical interpretation as the work of the inspired persons of the community, the Teacher of righteousness and other inspired teachers (*maskilim*). As an eschatological exegesis, it transposed OT prophecies that were intended for the prophets' time to the Qumran community who viewed themselves as the eschatological community that brought in the messianic age.[67] Similarly, R.N. Longenecker describes biblical interpretation at Qumran to be 'first of all revelatory and/or charismatic in nature'. And he calls Qumran's eschatological emphasis a 'This is That' fulfillment motif used in contrast to the rabbis' 'That has relevance to This' manner of applying the Scripture to the present situation.[68]

Because of the combination of rabbinic methods and the eschatological *raz-pesher* revelational motif in the Qumran scrolls, scholars debate whether or not to define the Qumran expositions and techniques as a type of midrash and to call them *pesher* midrash. Those who emphasize the distinctive revelatory aspect minimize the

unveil the hidden meaning of the text. Thus, the Pesher attains these results as if the Prophetic words were a mysterious inscription of a dream.' Similarly, M. Fishbane, 'The Qumran Pesher and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics', in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1979), I, pp. 97-114, argues that Qumran's *pesher* interpretation had roots in the ancient Near East's mantological interpretation and that it combined this with rabbinic methods. J.J. Collins, 'Prophecy and Fulfillment in the Qumran Scrolls', *JETS* 30 (1987), pp. 267-78, likewise sees the method rooted in ancient Near East's dream interpretation and also finds affinities in Daniel's dream interpretation and rabbinic midrash. See also n. 69 for others who stress the similarity to Daniel's dream interpretation.

67. Ellis, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', pp. 160-61, claims that these factors are especially pertinent to NT studies. See also *idem*, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 68-70; and Fitzmyer, 'Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Literature', pp. 305-33, who examines the way Qumran and the NT made use of quotations in four categories: literal/historical, modernized (typological), accommodated and eschatological. For further comparisons between the exegesis of Qumran and the NT, see, e.g., Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, pp. 66-77; and *idem*, 'Biblical Exposition at Qumran', pp. 97-98. On broader comparisons between the DSS and the NT, see, e.g., *idem*, 'The Dead Sea Scrolls and Early Christianity', *BJRL* 49 (1966), pp. 69-90; and *idem*, 'Qumran and the New Testament', *Faith and Thought* 90 (1958), pp. 92-102.

68. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, p. 43.

midrashic elements and insist that we may only call it *pesher*.[69] Others who use the label *pesher* midrash (or some type of midrash, such as Qumran midrash) see it as a type of midrash and use both words to describe the presence of both elements.[70] *Pesher* midrash is certainly

69. E.g., M. Black, 'The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New', *NTS* 18 (1971), p. 1, states '*midrash-pesher* is a modern invention probably best forgotten'. C. Roth, 'The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis', *VT* 10 (1960), pp. 51-52, writes, 'It [*pesher* literature] does not attempt to elucidate the Biblical text, but to determine the application... of certain Biblical prophecies: and the application of these Biblical prophecies in precise terms, to current and even contemporary events... In fact, the peser is neither "commentary" nor "midrash", but the inspired application of the terms of the Biblical prophecies to the "End of Days".' Similarly, Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 41-45, says, 'The crucial question in defining pesher interpretation has to do with the point of departure. In contradistinction to rabbinic exegesis which spoke of "That has relevance to This", the Dead Sea convenanters treated Scripture in a "This is That" fashion.' He admits midrashic procedures were used at Qumran but stresses that the revelational nature of the exegesis is primary. If the term midrash is used, he thinks we should use the term 'charismatic midrash' to distinguish it from rabbinic midrash. Cf. I. Rabinowitz, '*Pesher/Pittaron*', *RevQ* 8 (1973), pp. 219-32, who argues that the *peshers* are not midrashic in method or form and must be defined as a literary genre that foretells the future. Others emphasize the scrolls' similarity to Daniel's dream interpretation rather than rabbinic methods: e.g., K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1953), pp. 154-64; O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1960), pp. 75-78; and Horgan, *Pesharim*, p. 252.

70. As stated above (n. 56) Brownlee was the first to use this term and find similarities in rabbinic midrashic methods (e.g., in 'Biblical Interpretation'). He has been followed by such scholars as Stendahl, *School*, p. 184; and Ellis, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 159. For detailed studies on Qumran exegesis, comparisons to rabbinic exegesis, and classification of the scrolls as midrash, see esp. E. Slomovic, 'Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls', *RevQ* 7 (1969), pp. 3-15, who finds both the midrashic exegesis of the rabbis (e.g., *gezerah shawah*) and the charismatic revelation of Daniel in the DSS. L.H. Silberman, 'Unriddling the Riddle', *RevQ* 3 (1961), pp. 323-64, proposes that the Qumran *pesher* was a late development of midrash that combined revelatory interpretation and midrashic devices. Similarly, Finkel, 'Pesher of Dreams'; Fishbane, 'Mikra at Qumran'; Bruce, 'Biblical Exposition at Qumran', pp. 77-98; *idem*, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*; Vermes, 'Qumran Interpretation'; and Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 68-70. Cf. G. Brooke, 'Qumran Pesher', *RevQ* 10 (1981), pp. 483-503; and *idem*, *Exegesis at Qumran*, pp. 149-56, who argues the DSS commentaries should be called Qumran midrash rather than *pesher* which should be reserved for the formula. See also n. 64.

the most appropriate designation because it takes into account both the common procedures of midrash and the distinctive perspectives and techniques of the Qumran scrolls, and also because the *pesher* is identified as a midrash in 4QFlor 1.14, 19.

A second distinctive characteristic of *pesher* midrash exegesis is Qumran's practice of choosing and creating variant textual readings for purposes of exegesis;[71] this procedure most often involved wordplay alterations of letters.[72] It may be described as a charismatic technique employed to serve its eschatological perspective and to make the biblical texts apply to themselves. In other words, this method adapts or alters the biblical text for the sake of the interpretation in the commentary.[73] For example, 1QpHab 8.3 changes Hab. 2.5's 'wine' (היין) to 'wealth' (הון) because it applies these words to the Wicked Priest who 'treated the commandments treacherously for the

71. Although there are some instances of text modification in the rabbis, it is not as prevalent as in the scrolls. See, e.g., Finkel, 'Pesher of Dreams', pp. 368-69, who cites examples from the Babylonian Talmud where the rabbis used dual readings of a text and dual meanings of a word to serve their exegesis, usually by changing letters in a word (e.g., *b. Ber.* 46a on Isa. 54.13), but sometimes even by allowing the Greek reading to provide the meaning for the Hebrew (e.g., *b. Sukk.* 35a on Lev. 23.40). Cf. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 36-37.

72. Brownlee, 'Biblical Interpretation', pp. 54-76, lists this point (1) due to the fifty plus deviations of 1QpHab from the MT, many of which have no parallel in any of the versions, and (2) due to the four places where the OT text was read as though it were multiform (i.e., it seems as if the words were given several meanings and the text had more than one wording, one for the quotation and another for the commentary). Yet he minimizes the possibility of deliberate alterations and holds to the likelihood of the choosing of a variant reading from among several divergent texts to make the theological point (cf. his points 3, 4). For a listing and discussion of the variants see W.H. Brownlee, *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran* (Philadelphia: SBL, 1959); and W.H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979). Others stress intentional alterations or '*ad hoc* creations' for exegetical purposes: e.g., Stendahl, *School*, pp. 186-90; G.J. Brooke, 'The Biblical Texts in the Qumran Commentaries', in C.A. Evans and W.H. Stinespring (eds.), *Early Christian and Jewish Exegesis* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), pp. 85-100; and T.H. Lim, 'Eschatological Orientation and the Alteration of Scripture in the Habakkuk Pesher', *JNES* 49 (1990), pp. 185-94. Otherwise: e.g., Moo, *Old Testament in Passion Narratives*, pp. 40-51, favors the use of variants. Cf. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 39-41, who is uncertain if variants were chosen or created.

73. See Ellis, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 160; *idem*, 'Midrash', pp. 189-90; and *idem*, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 68-70.

sake of wealth' (1QpHab 8.10-11). Further, 4QTestim 1.22 omitted 'Jericho' from Josh. 6.26 to apply the text to the present situation of the community.

Explicit Midrash

In ancient Judaism explicit midrash appears in various types of commentary patterns. For example, in the Qumran scrolls it occurs in three kinds of expository patterns: single OT quotations (e.g., CD 4.14), an anthology of texts (e.g., 4QFlor) and verse by verse commentary on an OT book (e.g., 1QpHab). In the rabbinic expositions it appears frequently in literary forms known as the *proem* and *yelammedenu rabbenu* ('let our master teach us') midrashim.[74] The rabbinic *proem* midrash usually had the following form:

1. The (Pentateuchal) text for the day.
2. A second text, the *proem* or 'opening' for the discourse.

74. Bowker, *Targums*, p. 74, after a discussion of the synagogue lectionary and readings, offers the following explanation of the sermons: 'The homilies that have survived fall into roughly two groups, the proem and the yelammedenu homilies. The proem homily is so called because it starts from a proem (introductory) text; the text was chosen from a part of scripture outside of the *seder* [reading from the law] and the *haftarah* [reading from the prophets] of the day, and formed a bridge between them [by a catchword that joined the proem text to the initial texts]. The yelammedenu homily is so called because it derives from a request for instruction, *yelammedenu rabbenu* ("let our teacher instruct us"). The question raised was usually halakic, and it takes the place of the proem text. The homilies were constructed on very precise lines [by linking texts and commentary by catchwords] in which the basic method was *haruzin*. The word *haruzin* means "stringing beads together", or in other words stringing texts of scripture together, leading from the proem text (or halakic question) to the *seder*-reading. Homilies usually end by quoting from the *seder* of the day. On the "necklace of texts" was attached exegetical material, both halakic and haggadic, in profusion. Throughout the homily the *haftarah* for the day was implied but scarcely ever quoted... Thus the homilies wove together the lectionary readings for the day, using as a basic thread texts from all parts of scripture.' For a more detailed analysis, see *idem*, 'Speeches in Acts', *NTS* 14 (1967–68), pp. 97-101, who stresses that the account of homiletic forms given above is a summary of the main outlines only and that there are many variations in detail, variations that often are a consequence of the works which preserve the homilies (p. 101 n. 4).

3. Exposition, including supplementary quotations, parables and other commentary with verbal links to the initial and final texts.
4. A final text, usually repeating or alluding to the text for the day, and sometimes adding a concluding application.[75]

The *yelammedenu* midrash generally has the same basic form as the *proem* homily except for an interrogative opening (often in the place of the *proem* text), posing a question or problem for the exposition to answer. It arose due to the practice on important festival months in which the synagogue congregation would ask the teacher a question about the day's reading on which he would build a scriptural lesson.

These midrashic forms are frequent in the rabbinic collections of homiletic midrashim.[76] For example, the *proem* form appears in

75. This list and examples are found, e.g., in Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 96-100; *idem*, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', pp. 154-59; and *idem*, 'New Directions', pp. 247-53. For further studies of the *proem* and *yelammedenu* patterns, see, e.g., S. Maybaum, *Die ältesten Phasen in der Entwickelung der jüdischen Predigt* (Berlin: Itzkowski, 1901); W. Bacher, *Die Proömien der alten jüdischen Homilie* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913); E. Stein, 'Die homiletische Peroratio im Midrasch', *HUCA* 8-9 (1931–32), pp. 353-71; J. Mann, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1940), I, pp. 11-15; J. Heinemann, 'The Proem in the Aggadic Midrashim', in J. Heinemann and D. Noy (eds.), *Scripta Hierosolymitana* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1971), pp. 100-22; A. Goldberg, 'Versuch über die hermeneutische Präsupposition und Struktur der Petiha', *Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge* 8 (1980), pp. 1-59; Guiding, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 36-41; A. Finkel, *The Pharisees and the Teacher of Nazareth* (Leiden: Brill, 1964), pp. 155-72; P. Borgen, *Bread From Heaven* (Leiden: Brill, 1965), pp. 28-58; Bowker, *Targums*, pp. 72-77; and *idem*, 'Speeches', pp. 96-111.

76. The three oldest collections are *Pesiqta deRab Kahana*, *Pesiqta Rabbati* and *Tanḥuma*. For a general introduction to these collections, see Bowker, *Targums*, pp. 74-77. For the primary texts in English translation with detailed introductions see W.G. Braude and I.J. Kapstein (eds.), *Pesikta de-Rab Kahana* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1975), which consists of twenty-eight sermons on special Sabbaths and festivals. It was compiled in the fifth century AD although the homilies date from the first century BC to the end of the fourth century AD. W.G. Braude (ed.), *Pesikta Rabbati* (2 vols.; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968) is a collection of fifty-two homilies on special Sabbaths and festivals, which follow one of five patterns (over half are *yelammedenu*; the other four are similar patterns). He dates the collection in the seventh century and the sermons from third- and fourth-century Palestinian rabbis. J.T. Townsend (ed.), *Midrash*

Pes. R. 34.1: Zech. 9.9 + Isa. 61.9 + commentary with verbal links, illustrations, and supplementary texts (Isa. 33.2; 62.2) + a final reference to Isa. 61.9.[77] The *yelammedenu* midrash can be clearly seen in *Pes. R.* 41.1: Joel 2.1 and *yelammedenu* request + Lev. 2.34 + exposition, via application with word links to Lev. 2.34 and additional texts (Isa. 2.3; 1.27) + a concluding reference to Joel 2.1.[78]

Although the rabbinic collections of these patterns postdate the NT by several centuries,[79] identical patterns appear in rabbinic expositions

Tanhuma. I. *Genesis* (Hoboken: Ktav, 1989), has recently published an English translation of a portion of the S. Buber recension of *Tanḥuma*, a ninth-century collection of twelve sets of lections on Genesis, largely consisting of *yelammedenu* patterns.

77. See Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 96 n. 72. Cf. *idem*, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 155 n. 35, for an analysis of *Pes. R.* 33.7: Isa. 51.12 + Hos. 6.1 + exposition with a parable and application, linked verbally to the second text + Lam. 1.13 + Isa. 51.12. For other examples of the pattern, see, e.g., *Pes. R.* 44.4, 5a, 7.

78. For *yelammedenu* examples, see, e.g., *Pes. R.*, Piskas 1-14, 19, 25, 29, 31, 33, 38-45, 47-49. Cf. Mann, *Bible as Read and Preached*, pp. 23-554, who provides a detailed discussion and numerous examples of *yelammedenu* forms.

79. In the rabbinic homily collections the sermons frequently (1) contain comments by several rabbis that seem to reflect redactional work in the process of compilation, (2) are more complex than the form listed above, and (3) have slight variations from the standard patterns. E.g., the exposition and concluding text may refer to the *proem* text rather than to the initial text. See Bacher, *Proömien*, p. 19, who thought that the *proem* text developed from an earlier practice of supplementing the initial text with non-Pentateuchal citations. Maybaum, *Predigt*, pp. 41-42, recognized that the exposition may be an exegesis of either the *proem* or initial text and suggests that at an early stage in the development of the pattern the *proem* text introduced the exegesis of the initial text, but later the *proem* text became the basis of the sermon. Borgen, *Bread*, pp. 52-54, follows Bacher and Maybaum; and Ellis, 'Exegetical Patterns in 1 Corinthians and Romans', in *Prophecy and Hermeneutic* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1978), pp. 215 n. 4, 216 n. 7, stresses variations in the form at an early stage. Similarly, Bowker, 'Speeches', p. 101 n. 4, thinks that some variations in the forms of the sermons are the result of the works in which they are preserved. Otherwise: Heinemann, *Proem*, pp. 100-22, disagrees with the conclusions of such scholars as Bacher, Maybaum and Borgen. He argues that the literary *proem* homilies were heavily influenced by redaction, that the live *proem* homilies never began with the pericope text but ended with it, that the live *proem* homilies always began with the *proem* text, and that the openings with the pericope text in the literary *proems* are redactional (pp. 100-104). He concludes that the *proem* homily often was given before the Scripture readings for the day and served to introduce them (pp. 104-11)

that are given a pre-70 background by some scholars.[80] Similar patterns have been identified in the expositions of Philo, a first-century Jewish scholar,[81] and in most NT books.[82] The presence of these

and that the form of the homily sometimes varied and became more stereotyped as it evolved (pp. 112-22).

80. For examples of the *proem* form in pre-70 Judaism, see *Gen. R.* 41 (42).1, cited by Mann, *Bible as Read and Preached*, pp. 104-106; and discussed by Bowker, 'Speeches', p. 97 n. 4 (cf. *Mek.* Exod. 14.10; *Sifre* Num. 6.26, discussed by M. Smith, *Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels* [Philadelphia: SBL, 1951], cited by Bowker, 'Speeches', p. 97 n. 2). Also see *Mek.* Exod. 19.2 (69b); *Sifre* Deut. 3.23 (70a), cited in Str–B, IV, pp. 173-78. For the *yelammedenu* form (c. 34 BC) see *t. Pes.* 4.12; *b. Pes.* 66a; *y. Pes.* 33a; cited by Finkel, *Teacher of Nazareth*, pp. 169-72, who also notes that the rabbinic tradition for this practice is found in *b. Meg.* 32a; *y. Meg.* 75a; *Sifra* Lev. 33.44.

81. E.g., *Mut. Nom.* 253-63: Gen. 17.19 + exposition with verbal links to the initial text + a second text (Exod. 16.4) + a concluding reference to the initial text. *Leg. All.* 3.162-68: Exod. 16.4 + exposition with verbal links to the opening text + a second text (Exod. 12.4) + a concluding reference to the final text. For similar patterns in Philo, see, e.g., *Leg. All.* 3.65-75; 3.169-73; *Sacr.* 76-87; *Somn.* 2.17-30. For a detailed analysis of these homilies and a comparison to those in the NT (Jn 6.31-58; Gal. 3.6-29; Rom. 4.1-22) and Palestinian midrashim (*Exod. R.* 25.1, 2, 6) see Borgen, *Bread*, pp. 29-58. He finds a similarity between the patterns in these three bodies of literature and thinks that the patterns in the Palestinian Midrashim are more developed and stereotypical than those in the NT and Philo which (1) represent an earlier stage in the development of the pattern and (2) show more variation. Thus he says 'it is reasonable... to conclude the same homiletic pattern is found in Philo, John, Paul and the Palestinian midrash. The material produced from the Palestinian midrashim was written down later than the time of Philo, John, and Paul, but must also go back to that period. Since it cannot have been brought into the Palestinian midrash from Philo, John or Paul, the only reasonable deduction is that this homiletic pattern was commonly used in Judaism and the early Church both within and outside Palestine in the first century of the Christian era'. Cf. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 96-100; and *idem*, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', pp. 154-59.

82. See esp. Ellis, *Prophecy, passim*; and *idem*, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 96-100, 132-38, who has found patterns in most NT books. Cf. Borgen, *Bread*, pp. 28-58 (the first to see the *proem* in the NT); *idem*, 'Observations on the Midrashic Character of John 6', *ZNW* 54 (1963), pp. 232-40; *idem*, 'Observations on the Targumic Character of the Prologue of John', *NTS* 16 (1970), pp. 288-95; Bowker, 'Speeches', pp. 96-111 (the first to see the *yelammedenu* in the NT); V.P. Branick, 'Source Redaction Analysis of 1 Corinthians 1-3', *JBL* 101 (1982), pp. 251-69; Finkel, *Teacher of Nazareth*, pp. 155-72; L. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted* (Lund: Gleerup, 1966); W.A. Meeks, '"And

patterns in the rabbis, Philo and the NT suggests a widespread usage of these forms among first-century Jews.[83]

Literal Interpretation

In spite of the common conception that Jewish scriptural interpretation in the NT era usually employed certain midrashic methods or more fanciful techniques that would be considered unacceptable today, Jewish theologians did frequently interpret Scripture in a literal fashion, according to its obvious and plain meaning. As is evident from the rabbinic literature, they practiced this method particularly in applying the Deuteronomic law to the people's everyday lives. At times they interpreted Scripture so literally that their interpretation may be characterized as wooden. For example, *Ber.* 1.3 on Deut. 6.7 states that the School of Shammai taught that the Shema should be recited *literally* lying down in the evening and *literally* standing in the morning (also see *Sanh.* 8.4 on Deut. 21.19-20).[84]

Literal interpretation, however, is not the most common type of exposition found in the talmudic literature; midrashic exegesis is the most predominant. Rabbi Simeon Lowy explains that

> the reason for this may be that this type of commentary [literal] was expected to be known by everyone; and since there were no disputations about it, it was not recorded... The rabbis considered the plain interpretation of the laws, based on a literal understanding, as being of equal value

Rose up to Play"', *JSNT* 16 (1982), pp. 64-78; R. Scroggs, 'Paul as Rhetorician', in R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs (eds.), *Jews, Greeks and Christians* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), p. 271-98; W.R. Stegner, 'Romans 9.6-29—A Midrash', *JSNT* 22 (1984), pp. 37-52; and W. Wuellner, 'Haggadic Homily Genre in 1 Corinthians 1–3', *JBL* 89 (1970), pp. 199-204. These studies have shown many similarities, some minor differences, and a common root to exist between the rabbinic and NT midrashic patterns. For an explanation of the similarities and differences between NT and rabbinic patterns, see esp. Borgen, *Bread*, pp. 51-58; and Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 97.

83. See Borgen, *Bread*, pp. 28-58, esp. 51-54; and Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 96-100.

84. See Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 28-32, for additional detail and examples. He calls this 'literal*ist*' interpretation; at the suggestion of E.E. Ellis I simply call it literal interpretation (italics mine). Cf. F. Kermode, 'The Plain Sense of Things', in G.H. Hartman and S. Budick (eds.), *Midrash and Literature* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), pp. 179-94.

> with 'things which the Sadducees agreed upon', and that these should be learned in the elementary school (*Sanh.* 33b; *Hor.* 5a, b).[85]

Literal interpretation is more predominant in early Tannaitic literature and formed the basis of more complicated exegesis. Yet even in writings that are known for more elaborate methods, a literal exegesis of Scripture is often present. For example, numerous instances of literal exegesis may be found in Philo who is famous for his use of allegory and the DSS which most often employed the *pesher* method.[86]

There is often some misunderstanding over the Hebrew term *peshat* (פשט), which is used by many scholars to describe the literal interpretation of Scripture. In the OT it means 'to strip off (a garment), flatten, make a dash' (cf. 1QM 7.2; 8.6), and in later Hebrew it came to mean 'to extend, stretch out, make plain'. In the rabbinic works פשט often was used synonymously with דרש and meant 'to explain, teach, interpret'. It sometimes was used to describe a literal exegesis but not always. Raphael Loewe, in the classic essay on the term, argues that פשט actually came to mean the authoritative teaching, was often used as a synonym for דרש, and frequently was employed to describe a nonliteral exegesis.[87] Although *peshat* does not always denote a literal exegesis, it is a fact that ancient Jewish theologians often employed a literal exegesis of the Scripture, and this is the essential point to be seen here.[88]

85. S. Lowy, 'Some Aspects of Normative and Sectarian Interpretation of the Scriptures', *ALUOS* 6 (1966–68), pp. 99, 131 n. 10.

86. See Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 29-31. For examples of literal exegesis in Philo he cites *Migr. Abr.* 89-94; *Vit. Mos.* 44; *Exsecr.* 138-39; *Quaest. in Gen.* 1.6, 14, 20-22, 25, 32, 53. In the DSS he cites 1QS 1.1-3. Cf. Josephus, *War* 2.8.9 §147, who characterizes Qumran's hyperliteralism in keeping the law.

87. R. Loewe, 'The "Plain" Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis', *Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies* 1 (1964), pp. 140-85, studies the meaning of the term in its occurrences in Jewish literature from the OT through the Amoraic age. See his n. 189 for a list of scholars he finds incorrectly using the term. Otherwise: e.g., Kasher, 'Scripture in Rabbinic Literature', pp. 552-84, argues that *peshat* is based on interpretation according to context and philology while midrash ignores these factors.

88. See Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 31-32.

Now that the exegetical procedures used for biblical interpretation in the Judaism of Jesus' day have been examined, Jesus' expositions of explicit OT citations in Lukan expository episodes will be examined in light of these methods in Chapters 3 and 4.[89]

89. My study will build particularly on those done by Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*; Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*; Ellis, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old'; and *idem*, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*. *Pace*, e.g., A.J. Saldarini, 'Judaism and the New Testament', in E.J. Epp and G.W. MacRae (eds.), *The New Testament and its Modern Interpreters* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989), pp. 27-54; W.J. Kaiser, Jr, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody, 1985); and Towner, 'Hermeneutical Systems', pp. 131-35, who object to such analogies between ancient Jewish exegetical methods and those in the NT.

Chapter 3

THE EXPOSITION OF OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS BY JESUS IN LUKE 1–19

As it is well known, the Gospel accounts reveal that most of Jesus' teaching and much of his discussion with his opponents concern his exegesis of and his claims to fulfill the OT. In the Gospel of Luke there are eight pericopes in which explicit OT citations appear within Jesus' expository episodes[1] as he teaches about his person and ministry, the kingdom of God and ethics, and as he interacts with those opposed to his ministry and his interpretations of Scripture. These passages are as follows:

1. The temptation (4.1-13)
2. The Nazareth sermon (4.16-30)
3. The discussion with the lawyer (10.25-37)
4. The discussion with the rich ruler (18.18-30)
5. The exposition on Isaiah 5 (20.9-19)
6. The exposition on the resurrection (20.27-40)
7. The exposition on the messiah as David's Lord (20.41-44)
8. The saying on the coming of the Son of Man in the eschatological discourse (21.25-28)

Chapters 3 and 4 will consider these narratives in light of the exegetical methods of first-century Judaism through the following fourfold method: (1) an overview of the pertinent introductory issues,

1. In Luke there are also eight passages in which Jesus quotes isolated or non-expository OT citations, i.e., OT quotations in which little or no comment or exposition is given. They are as follows: Lk. 7.27 (Mal. 3.1); Lk. 8.10 (Isa. 6.9); Lk. 13.35 (Ps. 118.26); Lk. 19.46 (Isa. 56.7; Jer. 7.11); Lk. 22.37 (Isa. 53.12); Lk. 22.69 (Ps. 110.1); Lk. 23.30 (Hos. 10.8); Lk. 23.46 (Ps. 31.5). These are not dealt with in this work because of their nonexpository nature, but the Greek texts of the citations are listed in Appendix E.

(2) an examination of the text form of the explicit citations, (3) an exegesis of the passages that focuses on Jesus' exegetical methods and resulting expositions, and (4) a literary analysis of the expositions.

The Temptation (4.1-13)

The temptation of Jesus is recorded in all three Synoptic Gospels (Mt. 4.1-11 = Lk. 4.1-13; Mk 1.12-13).[2] While Mark's version is quite brief and lacks the dialogue and the OT citations, a more detailed common tradition (i.e., Q material[3]) is preserved by Matthew and Luke in which the discourse between Jesus and the devil largely revolves around Scripture quotations.

There are a number of slight variations between Luke and Matthew's account.[4] It is uncertain to which Evangelist to attribute the changes from the original material since we do not possess the

2. Because of the present state of the Synoptic problem, I have chosen to simply make comparisons with parallel passages without a commitment to any particular source theory. For a similar stance, see, e.g., C.H. Talbert, *Reading Luke* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), pp. 1-2; and L. Morris, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), pp. x-xi, 15-17. For a recent evaluation of the Synoptic problem, see, e.g., D. Wenham, 'Source Criticism', in I.H. Marshall (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), pp. 139-52; R.H. Stein, *The Synoptic Problem* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987); *idem*, 'Synoptic Problem', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 784-92; and Ellis, 'Gospels Criticism', pp. 33-37, who writes, 'In the present state of affairs source criticism appears either to have come full circle or to have reached something of an impasse'.

3. Some scholars think that Luke used both Q and Mk 1.12-13. See, e.g., T. Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), p. 36; and Marshall, *Luke*, p. 166. Although most scholars use Q to refer to the source(s) of non-Markan traditions common to Matthew and Luke within a Markan priority source theory, I will only use Q to refer to the common traditions without making a source-critical assumption.

4. For a thorough redactional study of the Lukan account, see J. Dupont, 'Les tentations de Jésus dans le récit de Luc (Luc, 4, 1-13)', *Sciences ecclésiastiques* 14 (1962), pp. 7-29 (cf. *idem*, 'The Temptations of Jesus in Luke', *TD* 14 [1966], pp. 213-17), reprinted along with two previously published essays on the Matthaean version and the origin of the account in *idem*, *Les tentations du Jésus au désert* (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1968). For a concise list of the supposed redactional modifications, see Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, pp. 506-508.

original source(s) and since the best Lukan scholars often disagree.[5] Thus, while comparisons are of value, it remains somewhat speculative to argue which Evangelist preserves what was original to the Q material.

The order of the second and third temptations is the most significant difference between Matthew and Luke. Although a few scholars argue for the originality of Luke's order,[6] most authorities give Matthew's order priority.[7] The most accepted and persuasive supposition for Luke's probable modification is that he changed the order so that the temptation in the temple at Jerusalem would be seen to be a climax, as a foreshadowing of Jesus' final triumph in Jerusalem at his passion.[8]

Several scholars, most of whom adhere to classical form criticism, reject the historicity of the account, citing such factors as the unique

5. E.g., Lk. 4.9 has Ἰερουσαλήμ; Mt. 4.5 has τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν. While Marshall, *Luke*, p. 172, contends Matthew's phrase is secondary, Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 516, asserts that Luke changed the original form in Q. For helpful critiques of the values and of the shortcomings of redaction criticism, see, e.g., Carson, 'Redaction Criticism', pp. 119-42; S.S. Smalley, 'Redaction Criticism', in Marshall (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation*, pp. 181-95; and G.R. Osborne, 'Redaction Criticism', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 662-69.

6. E.g., T.W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), pp. 42-43, finds that 'Matthew's arrangement works up to a fine dramatic climax, so fine that it is difficult to imagine what could have induced Luke to alter it'. Similarly, A. Plummer, *The Gospel according to S. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 5th edn, 1922), p. 100; H. Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Freiburg: Herder, rev. edn, 1984), I, p. 218; and Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 256.

7. E.g., J. Nolland, *Luke 1–9.20* (WBC; Dallas: Word Books, 1989), p. 177; Ellis, *Luke*, p. 94; Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, pp. 507-508; and Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 166-67. The last two works list arguments with representatives of both positions. See also H. Swanston, 'The Lukan Temptation Narrative', *JTS* 17 (1966), p. 71, who notes that Jesus' replies from Deuteronomy are not in the order of Matthew, Deuteronomy or the events in the Exodus account to which they allude. He proposes that the Lukan order is based on Ps. 106, which alludes to the same OT incidents in the Lukan order; this supposition is strengthened by 1 Cor. 10.6-9 which also refers to the Exodus events in the same order.

8. Other reasons often given in favor of a Lukan change are as follows: (1) The Son of God temptations are together in Matthew which seems to be the most original, (2) the most blatant temptation (worship me) is last in Matthew, (3) only Matthew uses the potentially chronological connective τότε to link the first two temptations, and (4) Matthew's order corresponds with a well-known midrash on Deut. 6.5 (*Ber.* 9.5).

personal appearance of Satan, the limitation of Jesus' words to OT quotations (besides ὕπαγε, σατανᾶ in Mt. 4.10) along with the extensive use of OT citations and allusions in the passage, and differing opinions over the nature of the event and intention of the narrative. Thus, they argue that the narrative is a mythical account created by the early church.[9] Similarly, some who hold to this view characterize the passage as a 'haggadic midrash' created by an early Christian scribe to deal with problems in the church.[10]

Other scholars, more confident in the historical reliability of the

9. See, e.g., D.F. Strauss, *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined* (trans. G. Eliot; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972 [1848]), pp. 252-59, who was an early proponent of the mythological treatment of the Gospels and influenced the Bultmann school and classical form criticism. Similarly, C.K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK, rev. edn, 1966), pp. 46-53; G.B. Caird, *The Gospel of St Luke* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1963), pp. 79-81; Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 255; and J.M. Creed, *The Gospel according to St Luke* (London: Macmillan, 1930), pp. 61-62.

10. Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 254-57, the foremost pioneer of classical form criticism, calls the Q account 'a secondary formulation' and a 'scribal Haggadah' given the form of controversy dialogues found in rabbinic disputations and created to distinguish Christian miracle working from magic. B. Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son* (trans. J. Toy; Lund: Gleerup, 1966), pp. 7-18, an opponent of classical form criticism and an advocate of the historical reliability of the Jesus tradition, claims that because the temptation narrative concerns a tradition before Jesus' public ministry, it is in a different category than those within it. He sees this narrative as mythological with 'a very slight connection with history'; it is a haggadic midrash on Deut. 6–8 that was created by early scribes and that has themes found in the rabbinic exegesis of the *Shema* (Deut. 6.5). For a characterization of Bultmann and Gerhardsson's positions on the Gospel tradition, see Chapter 1's section on the preresurrection origin of Jesus' OT usage. See also, e.g., A. Fridrichsen, *The Problem of Miracle in Primitive Christianity* (trans. R.A. Harrisville and J.S. Hanson; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), pp. 121-28, who is similar to Bultmann and argues that the narrative is a scribal creation due to a dispute between two church groups over the magical nature of miracles. P. Pokorny, 'The Temptation Stories and their Intentions', *NTS* 20 (1974), pp. 115-27, likewise thinks that the Synoptic accounts are a legend created by the church: Mark's version as an apology for Jesus' authority to drive out demons and to speak in God's name (i.e., to counter accusations that he was a demoniac) and Q's as a Christian midrash intended to reject contemporary Jewish concepts of the messiah. More recently, W.R. Stegner, 'The Temptation Narrative', *BR* 35 (1990), pp. 5-17, describes the narrative as a literary product of early Jewish Christianity that shows how they used the OT to witness to Jesus.

Jesus tradition, argue that the temptation account is based on a real occurrence in Jesus' life and that since there were no witnesses, Jesus must be the source of the account.[11] This estimation of the passage is quite probable if one recognizes, as has been argued above,[12] the historical concerns and the careful transmission of the Gospel tradition. Furthermore, the account does not reflect a post-resurrection setting since the temptations are messianic in nature rather than the common ones relevant to a *Sitz im Leben* in the early church.[13]

A number of other considerations support the historicity of the temptation account, such as the theological coherence that the temptation narrative has with the remainder of Jesus' ministry, the unlikelihood that the early church would create a temptation story about one in whom they believed to be the promised messiah and the Son of God, and the description of a vulnerability of Christ that was quite

11. J. Dupont, 'L'origine du récit des tentations de Jésus au désert', *RB* 73 (1966), pp. 30-76; reprinted in *idem*, *Les tentations*, pp. 73-130, contends that Jesus formulated the account during his ministry; i.e., he described an actual experience which occurred at the beginning of his ministry in graphic language that is not to be taken literally, probably recounting it to his disciples after he rebuked Peter at Caesarea Philippi (Mk 8.33). Several scholars follow Dupont with modifications: e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, pp. 509-10, claims the passage originated with Jesus and thinks that Jesus told it to his disciples 'as a figurative, parabolic résumés of the seduction latent in the diabolic opposition to him and his ministry' (cf. Lk. 22.31-32). Although the pericope has a real basis in Jesus' life, he prefers a figurative or parabolic interpretation over 'a naïve literalism'. Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 167-68, likewise sees it rooted in an inward, historical experience of Jesus told in dramatic form but with the present form affected by the early church. Cf. Nolland, *Luke 1–9.20*, pp. 177-78; and J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* (trans. J. Bowden; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), I, pp. 70-74, who speak of a historical nucleus. Plummer, *Luke*, p. 106, thinks that Jesus gave the account to his disciples 'in much the same form as that in which we have it here'. Similarly, France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, p. 51; and Manson, *Sayings*, pp. 44-45. For a critique of the community creation theory see the works above in this note, esp. Dupont for detail.

12. See Chapter 1's section on the preresurrection origin of the Jesus tradition. I will not repeat this argument for each pericope but will assume it to be one of the major factors in favor of the historicity of the various accounts.

13. Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 509, asserts that the temptations are 'scarcely born of temptations suffered by Christians and retrojected into the ministry of Jesus himself'. R.H. Stein, *Luke* (New American Community; Nashville: Broadman, 1992), p. 144, claims 'the fact that the temptations were introduced and concluded by "If you are the Son of God" indicates that all three were messianic in nature'. For a detailed argument, see Dupont, *Les tentations*, pp. 97-108.

unlike the messianic expectation of his disciples.[14]

The nature of Jesus' experience is an issue related to the historicity of this tradition. That it was a visionary or inward, spiritual experience is suggested by certain details in the account: the impossibility that an actual mountain peak could provide a view of the whole world (cf. Mt. 4.8), and particularly the remark that 'the devil took him up...in a moment of time' (Lk. 4.5).[15] This view preserves the reality of the event in the life of the earthly Jesus while also seeing it as different from an ordinary, human experience.

If we accept the historicity of the narrative with Jesus as its source, it seems likely that he recounted the experience to his disciples to relate its messianic significance[16] and to aid them in their temptations,

14. C.L. Blomberg, 'Temptation of Jesus', *ISBE*, IV, p. 785. Cf. G.H. Twelftree, 'Temptation of Jesus', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 821-27. For additional evidences in favor of the historicity of the account see also those works cited in n. 11.

15. Ellis, *Luke*, p. 95, alleges that the phrase 'implies that the experience... was understood to be different from a "nature" event'. Most scholars think that the entire experience was visionary in nature: e.g., Marshall, *Luke*, p. 171; Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 516; Creed, *Luke*, p. 63; Plummer, *Luke*, p. 109; Manson, *Sayings*, p. 44; L.T. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), p. 74. Blomberg, 'Temptation', p. 785; and Twelftree, 'Temptation', pp. 822-24. Cf. Stein, *Luke*, p. 144 n. 41, who notes that, while the second temptation seems to be visionary, 'the natural reading of the other two temptations appears to portray a real experience'.

16. Manson, *Sayings*, p. 46, suggests that Jesus told the experience to the disciples after they recognized him as the messiah in order to explain his conception of his messiahship. Several other works have shown that the temptation account is unquestionably messianic in nature. E.g., *idem*, *The Teaching of Jesus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2nd edn, 1963), pp. 196-97; H. Seesemann, 'πεῖρα κτλ.', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 23-36; H. Riesenfeld, 'The Messianic Character of the Temptation in the Wilderness', in *The Gospel Tradition* (trans. E.M. Rowley; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), pp. 75-93; A.J. Kirk, 'The Messianic Role of Jesus and the Temptation Narrative', *EvQ* 44 (1972), pp. 11-29, 91-102; Ellis, *Luke*, pp. 93-95; Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 166-68; N. Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951), pp. 159-60; and Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, I, p. 71. Otherwise: e.g., Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 254-56; and Nolland, *Luke 1–9.20*, p. 182, think the temptations are not messianic but merely exemplary (i.e., as experienced by every believer). Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 512, contends that Jesus is tempted as son but not as the messiah. Johnson, *Luke*, pp. 73-74, alleges that Jesus is presented as the prophet-like Moses in Luke–Acts as a whole and that Jesus is tested as a prophet in 4.1-13.

that is, as an encouragement and as a model for handling temptation.[17] This is clearly the *Sitz im Leben Jesu.*

The Text Form of the Quotations[18]

Four explicit OT citations occur in the temptation narrative of Matthew and Luke (Deut. 8.3; 6.13, 16; Ps. 91.11-12). Besides Lk. 13.35/Mt. 23.39, they are the only OT quotations common to Luke and Matthew and absent in Mark.

Before examining the text form of the citations it should be stressed that the LXX form of OT citations and allusions cannot be used as an argument for the secondary nature of the quotation. There are three possible reasons for a LXX form of OT citations to be attributed to Jesus rather than being seen as a creation by the early church: (1) an assimilation to the LXX by the Gospel traditioners or the evangelists,

17. Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 165-66, sees the same twofold theme in the temptation that appears in the baptism: the Spirit leading Jesus for his messianic task and Jesus, the Son of God, being obedient to the Father. 'We may be certain that the story was also told for its exemplary features in order to encourage Christians facing temptation and to indicate to them how to recognize and overcome it. They are to note that in each case Jesus replies to temptation with a quotation from Scripture, thereby indicating that the life of the man of God must follow certain clear principles expressive of God's will which have already been revealed in the OT'. Followed by Talbert, *Reading Luke*, p. 44. For a discussion of Jesus' temptations in comparison to those encountered by others, see A.V. Murray, 'The Temptation of Jesus', *ExpTim* (1948–49), pp. 99-101. Otherwise: e.g., S. Brown, *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), pp. 5-19, insists that Jesus' temptations are unique and not typical of other Christians. Followed by Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 518; similarly, Barrett, *Holy Spirit*, p. 48.

18. For studies on the issue of the text form of OT quotations in the NT, see, e.g., B.F.C. Atkinson, 'The Textual Background of the Use of the Old Testament by the New', *Journal of the Transactions of the Victorian Institute* 79 (1947), pp. 37-70; M. Silva, 'The New Testament Use of the Old Testament', in D.A. Carson and J.D. Woodbridge (eds.), *Scripture and Truth* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), pp. 147-65; M. Wilcox, 'Text Form', in Carson and Williamson (eds.), *It is Written*, pp. 193-204, and the literature cited. For discussions on the text form of Lukan citations, see esp. Holtz, *Zitate bei Lukas*; Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive*; Bock, *Proclamation*; Barrett, 'Luke/Acts', pp. 231-44; Ringgren, 'Luke's Use of the Old Testament', pp. 227-36; France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 25-37, 240-56; and Archer, *Quotations*. When paralleled in Matthew, see Stendahl, *School*; and Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel.*

(2) a quotation of a Semitic original like our LXX, and (3) an original quotation in Greek.[19]

Deuteronomy 8.3 in Luke 4.4

> καὶ ἀπεκρίθη πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· γέγραπται ὅτι οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος. (Lk. 4.4)

> καὶ ἐκάκωσέν σε καὶ ἐλιμαγχόνησέν σε καὶ ἐψώμισέν σε τὸ μαννα, ὃ οὐκ εἴδησαν οἱ πατέρες σου, ἵνα ἀναγγείλῃ σοι ὅτι οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι τῷ ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος. (Deut. 8.3 LXX)

> ויענך וירעבך ויאכלך את־המן אשר לא־ידעת ולא ידעון
> אבתיך למען הודעך כי לא על־הלחם לבדו יחיה האדם כי על־כל־מוצא
> פי־יהוה יחיה האדם׃
> (Deut. 8.3 MT)

In the portion of Deut. 8.3 that Lk. 4.4 and Mt. 4.4 cite, they agree with the LXX which faithfully renders the MT. They have the same IF (γέγραπται); yet Matthew's citation is longer, including ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ.[20]

19. On the LXX features of the OT citations attributed to Jesus and the three points noted above, see France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 25-26, who argues that Jesus' OT citations were normally in Aramaic and then translated into Greek and often assimilated to the LXX for incorporation into the Gospels and that the LXX form of quotations attributed to Jesus cannot be used as an argument against their authenticity. Moo, *Old Testament in Passion Narratives*, pp. 44-48, (and the literature cited) discusses the probability of a Hebrew textual tradition that was the basis of our LXX. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 63-66, contends that Jesus could speak Greek and that he was responsible for the LXX features in certain citations. For studies on the language of Jesus see n. 90.

20. Although some Lukan MSS have the longer reading, these most likely have been assimilated by copyists to Mt. 4.4/Deut. 8.3. See B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: UBS, 1971), p. 137. Cf. Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, I, p. 210 n. 164, who contends that all of the citation was in Q. Holtz, *Zitate bei Lukas*, p. 61; and Marshall, *Luke*, p. 171, think Matthew likely copied from the LXX. See also Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, p. 126, who claims that in the NT verses or parts of verses were used as pointers to the whole OT context. Similarly, Stendahl, *School*, p. 88 n. 1; and Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, p. 116, note that it was a rabbinic method to imply the context of a citation.

Deuteronomy 6.13 in Luke 4.8

καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· γέγραπται· κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις. (Lk. 4.8)

κύριον τὸν θεόν σου φοβηθήσῃ καὶ αὐτῷ λατρεύσεις καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν κολληθήσῃ καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ὀμῇ. (Deut. 6.13 LXX)

את־יהוה אלהיך תירא ואתו תעבד ובשמו תשבע׃
(Deut. 6.13 MT)

Lk. 4.8 and Mt. 4.10 agree both in their IF (γέγραπται) and in the portion of the verse that they reproduce. They also agree against both the MT and LXX in the addition of μόνῳ and in the reading of προσκυνήσεις for the LXX φοβηθήσῃ, MT תירא. Both differences agree with the LXX^{A} (and pap. 963) against all other texts, and the LXX^{A} seems to have been assimilated to the NT. The second difference from the OT (προσκυνήσεις) is best explained as an intentional accommodation to the devil's word of Lk. 4.7 (ἐὰν προσκυνήσῃς ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ) rather than as an assimilation to LXX^{A}. However, if it has an Aramaic *Vorlage*, it may reflect the targum reading תדחל (fear), which was commonly used in the sense of worship.[21]

Psalm 91.11-12 in Luke 4.10-11

[10]γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε, [11]καὶ ὅτι ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦσίν σε, μήποτε προσκόψῃς πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σου. (Lk. 4.10-11)

[11]ὅτι τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς σου: [12]ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦσίν σε, μήποτε προσκόψῃς πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σου. (Ps. 90.11-12 LXX)

[11]כי מלאכיו יצוה־לך לשמרך בכל־דרכיך׃ [12]על־כפים
ישאונך פן־תגף באבן רגלך׃
(Ps. 91. 11-12 MT)

Lk. 4.10-11 and Mt. 4.6 agree with the OT (LXX = MT). They have the same IF (γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι) and citation of Ps. 91.11-12 (MT =

21. See Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, 68-69; and France, *Jesus and the Old Testamrent*, pp. 241, 246. Otherwise: Stendahl, *School*, p. 89, emphasizes the presence of the deviations in LXX^{A} (and pap. 963) and thinks that it may render a Greek text which the NT used. Holtz, *Zitate bei Lukas*, pp. 62-63, sees Q following LXX^{A}.

LXX 90.11-12) except Lk. 4.10b preserves part of the second colon of Ps. 91.11 missing in Mt. 4.6 (τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε). Luke connects 91.11, 12 with καὶ ὅτι (Mt. 4.6, καί), possibly to stress the subsequent phrase or to indicate an omission in the citation.[22]

Deuteronomy 6.16 in Luke 4.12

> καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι εἴρηται· οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου. (Lk. 4.12)
>
> οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου, ὃν τρόπον ἐξεπειράσασθε ἐν τῷ Πειρασμῷ. (Deut. 6.16 LXX)
>
> לא תנסו את־יהוה אלהיכם כאשר נסיתם במסה׃
> (Deut. 6.16 MT)

Lk. 4.12 and Mt. 4.7 agree with the OT except for the omission of the latter part of the verse, and they have one agreement with the LXX against the MT by following the LXX singular ἐκπειράσεις against the MT plural תנסו (cf. *Targ.* תנסון).[23] They agree with each other except for different IF: while Matthew has πάλιν γέγραπται, Luke has εἴρηται.

An Exegesis of Luke 4.1-13[24]

The temptation narrative is closely linked to the baptism scene (3.21-22) despite Luke's insertion of Jesus' genealogy (3.23-38) between the two accounts.[25] Like the baptism, it sets forth God's preparation for Jesus' public ministry. The baptism depicts Jesus' commission as the servant-messiah (i.e., the royal messiah of Ps. 2.7; and the Isaianic servant of Isa. 42.1) and endowment with the Spirit for his messianic mission; the wilderness temptation depicts the effort of the

22. On καὶ ὅτι, see Marshall, *Luke*, p. 173; and Holtz, *Zitate bei Lukas*, pp. 57-58.

23. Other than the difference in verb number the LXX is faithful to the MT. Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, p. 68, gives two reasons why the LXX singular should not be stressed over the MT plural: (1) The NT singular depends on Jesus' application of the verse to his own situation, and (2) the LXX-*Vorlage* may have had a singular form.

24. My exegesis of the passages considered in Chapters 3 and 4 will not deal with every word and phrase of each verse but focus on the OT quotations and their exposition.

25. Virtually all the authorities agree on this point. *Pace*, e.g., Pokorny, 'Temptation Stories', p. 118.

devil to have him forsake this messianic role.

The three citations with which Jesus refutes the devil are significant because they all come from Deuteronomy (8.3; 6.13, 16) and recall three events in which OT Israel was tested in the wilderness (cf. Lk. 4.1) and failed.[26] They implicitly contrast Jesus' victory with Israel's failure and thereby represent an antithetical Israel–Christ typology.[27] As R.T. France states,

26. Israel in her exodus experience was frequently used as a type or example in Scripture. Besides the Pentateuch this theme appears, e.g., in Pss. 78; 81.11-13; 95.8-9; 106.6-8; Isa. 63.10; Jer. 7.22-24; Ezek. 20.5-7; 1 Cor. 10.1-13; Heb. 3.16-18; Jude 5.

27. For works that hold to an Israel-Christ typology, see esp. Gerhardsson, *Testing*; G.H.P. Thompson, 'Called—Proved—Obedient', *JTS* 11 (1960), pp. 1-12; J.A.T. Robinson, 'The Temptations', *Theology* 50 (1947), pp. 43-48; France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 50-53; J. Dupont, 'L'arrière-fond du récit des tentations de Jésus', *NTS* 3 (1957), pp. 287-304; and Twelftree, 'Temptation', pp. 821-27. Cf. Dupont, *Les tentations*, pp. 9-72, where he finds the OT Israel-Christ typology more prominent in Matthew than in Luke. Of the critical commentaries Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, pp. 510-13, has the fullest typological treatment. In less detail, see, e.g., Marshall, *Luke*, p. 166; and Evans, *Saint Luke*, pp. 255-56. Cf. A.B. Taylor, Jr, 'Decision in the Desert', *Int* 14 (1960), pp. 300-309, who emphasizes the OT background without the typology. Otherwise: e.g., Kirk, 'The Messianic Role of Jesus and the Temptation Narrative', objects to the Israel-Christ typology and maintains that the narrative must be understood against the background of current messianic expectations; that is, Jesus rejected the 'quietism' and materialism of the Sadducees and the violent revolution of the Zealots in favor of the Servant of Isaiah.

Others see an Adam–Christ typology particularly due to the Lukan redactional link of the temptation narrative with the genealogy, but this is much less explicit than the Israel–Christ typology. Talbert, *Reading Luke*, pp. 46-47, aptly characterizes this view and argues for the presence of both typologies: 'The temptations of Jesus thereby become antitypical of the experience of Israel in the wilderness and of the original pair in the garden: whereas those who came before fell, Jesus, as the second Adam and the true culmination of Israel's heritage, shows the way to victory, reversing Adam's fall and Israel's sin'. See also, e.g., A. Feuillet, 'Le récit lucanien de la tentation (Lc 4,1-13)', *Bib* 40 (1959), pp. 613-31, who has a detailed treatment. More briefly, Ellis, *Luke*, pp. 93-95; Geldenhuys, *Luke*, pp. 157-58; Thompson, 'Called', pp. 7-8; E. Best, *The Temptation and the Passion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), p. 10; and Twelftree, 'Temptation', p. 826. Otherwise: e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 512, calls an Adam–Christ interpretation 'highly eisegetical'.

For comprehensive studies on the subject of typology, see esp. the classic work of L. Goppelt, *Typos* (trans. D. Madvig; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982). For more recent and concise treatments of typology, see, e.g., R. Davidson, *Typology in*

> the fact that the choice was in all three cases made from this single small section of the Old Testament suggests that the passage was especially in Jesus' mind at the time, as a prefiguration of his own experience... His use of Deuteronomy... reflects his own basic conception of his status and ministry. And it is in typological terms: he not only wished to be seen, but saw himself, as Israel, tested and taught in the desert as God's 'son' Israel had been.[28]

Many scholars interpret the typology solely at the point of Jesus' relationship to God (i.e., at his sonship) rather than also at the point of his messiahship because they fail to see the messianic character of the temptations.[29] The following factors suggest that Jesus' temptation experience had a messianic character: (1) It was used by the devil to tempt him at the point of his messianic identity and vocation, (2) it had the purpose of preparing Jesus for his mission as the messiah, and (3) in its NT context it is surrounded by messianic events (i.e., the baptism and the Nazareth sermon). Therefore, since the devil tempts Jesus at the point of his messiahship and since Jesus answers him with citations that draw an Israel–Christ typology, we will examine the passage in light of both its messianic and its typological character.[30]

Narrative Setting (vv. 1-2). The typological use of the OT is shown not only by Jesus' choice of the OT quotations but also by the parallels between his situation and that of Israel. For example, it is seen in the parallels between Jesus' forty days of temptation in the wilderness[31]

Scripture (Berrien Springs: Andrews University, 1981); Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 105-109, 139-57; C.A. Evans, 'Typology', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 862-66, and the works there cited.

28. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 50-51. Cf. Plummer, *Luke*, p. 110, who thinks that because Jesus' replies come from Deuteronomy, he recently had been reading or meditating on it.

29. E.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 512; Gerhardsson, *Testing*; Robinson, 'The Temptations'; Thompson, 'Called'; and France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 50-53. Otherwise: e.g., Manson, *Sayings*, p. 43, argues that 'the Son of God' refers to the messiah here. For further works that hold to the messianic nature of the temptations, see n. 16.

30. My exegesis will have affinities to the works cited in nn. 27, 29 while also including the messianic element.

31. For studies of the motif of wilderness and testing in the Bible and the Qumran literature in comparison to the NT, see respectively U. Mauser, *Christ in the Wilderness* (Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1963); and W.R. Stegner, 'Wilderness and

compared with Israel's forty years of testing (Deut. 8.2), and Jesus' hunger compared with Israel's hunger and God's miraculous feeding (Deut. 8.3; Exod. 16.3).[32]

The typological character of the narrative and the obvious antithetical nature of this typology are further seen in the background and purpose of their testings as God's sons (Deut. 8.5; Lk. 4.3, 9). It is apparent in the following parallels: (1) Israel's delivery from Egypt and covenant with God at Sinai compared with Jesus' baptism and commission, (2) Israel's mission to conquer the promised land compared with Jesus' entrance into his mission as the messiah, and (3) Israel's wilderness wanderings as a result of its sin compared with Jesus' trip into the wilderness at the leadership of the Holy Spirit as a time of fellowship with God which Satan sought to destroy by tempting Jesus to forsake his mission.[33]

The Temptations (vv. 3-12). The Israel–Christ typology is even more evident in Jesus' three quotations from Deuteronomy, especially when examined in light of their OT contexts.

In the first temptation (4.3-4) the devil tempts Jesus as God's son[34]

Testing in the Scrolls and in Matthew 4.1-11', *BR* 12 (1967), pp. 18-27. For an analysis of the biblical and Jewish texts that mention the devil and testing, see, e.g., W. Foerster, 'διάβολος', *TDNT*, II, pp. 72-81; and *idem*, 'σατανᾶς', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 151-63. For studies of the place of the devil and his demons in the Gospels see, e.g., G.H. Twelftree, 'Demon, Devil, Satan', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 163-72, and the works cited.

32. Some scholars (e.g., A.R.C. Leaney, *The Gospel according to Luke* [London: A. & C. Black, 2nd edn, 1966], p. 114; G. Kittel, 'ἔρημος κτλ.', *TDNT*, II, p. 658; Barrett, *Holy Spirit*, p. 51; and Mauser, *Wilderness*, p. 99) see the parallel to the forty-day fasts of Moses at Sinai (Exod. 34.28; Deut. 9.9, 18) and of Elijah on the way to Mt Horeb (1 Kgs 19.5, 8). Others (e.g., Gerhardsson, *Testing*, pp. 41-43; France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, p. 51 n. 38; and Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 258) aptly object that there is no Moses or Elijah typology here for Jesus' fast only has meaning for the first temptation.

33. See Marshall, *Luke*, p. 170; and Kittel, 'ἔρημος', p. 658.

34. The phrase εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ is often taken as an expression of doubt (e.g., P. Doble, 'The Temptations', *ExpTim* 72 [1960], pp. 91-93; and Geldenhuys, *Luke*, p. 159). However, the form of the sentence is a first-class condition; thus, it expresses certainty, with 'if' having the force of 'since'. For this point, see, e.g., R. Holst, 'The Temptation of Jesus', *ExpTim* 82 (1971), pp. 343-44; and Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 258. Cf. Ellis, *Luke*, p. 94, who says the phrase εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ shows 'Satan's recognition of the messiahship of Jesus'.

to assert his independence from God by using his messianic powers to satisfy his own physical needs by a miracle, rather than to depend on God's provision for all his needs.[35]

Jesus responds with a citation from Deut. 8.3, introduced by γέγραπται, an IF that indicates that Scripture is 'the word of divine authority and, therefore, the word of finality'.[36] He refers to the lesson Israel was to have learned by her hunger and reception of the manna in the wilderness: reliance and obedience to God's word are more important than physical food, even if it means hunger. While Israel in her hunger complained and murmured against God (Exod. 16.2-3), lost her faith in him, and needed a miracle to restore it, Jesus submitted to God. Although Jesus later multiplied bread by a miracle to feed others (Lk. 9.10-17), he would not use his messianic powers to satisfy his own needs, but he relied on his Father's provision. In consideration of the manna provision spoken of in Deut. 8.3 (cf. 8.1-6), Jesus may have implied that he trusted in God's power to sustain him miraculously despite the lack of physical food.[37]

In the second temptation (4.5-8)[38] the devil, by his offer of all the

35. So, e.g., Nolland, *Luke 1–9.20*, p. 179; Ellis, *Luke*, pp. 94-95; Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 170-71, and works there cited. A common alternate interpretation often is suggested: it is a temptation to repeat the manna miracle of Moses, an expected sign of the messianic age (e.g., Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, I, p. 71; Barrett, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 51-52; Manson, *Sayings*, pp. 43-44; and Caird, *Luke*, p. 80). In Mt. 4.3-4 the temptation has the plural 'stones' and 'loaves' which can more easily fit this view, but Luke's singular nouns certainly prohibit this. This view cannot be held as (1) there is no audience or allusion to manna, (2) the one loaf is for Jesus' and not Israel's hunger, and (3) the passage deals with an Israel not a Moses typology (see the critique of this view by Marshall, *Luke*, p. 170; and Gerhardsson, *Testing*, pp. 43-48).

36. Ellis, *Luke*, p. 95. See also Marshall, *Luke*, p. 171.

37. On this implication see Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, I, pp. 208-10; and Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 511. Otherwise: Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 170-71. Cf. Gerhardsson, *Testing*, pp. 51-53, who thinks Jesus may have received spiritual nourishment like Israel's manna. Yet I agree with Marshall against Schürmann that Jesus was not free from hunger during the forty days as stated by Lk. 4.2.

38. This temptation is the only one not prefaced with εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ and has the strongest messianic overtones. Manson, *Sayings*, p. 43, says the phrase is not used here because 'the things which Satan is about to offer are already His by right, the right of the Messiah'. W.D. Davies and D.C. Allison, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), p. 372, suggest that the phrase 'is dropped because the request is no longer an act of power

kingdoms of the world,[39] tempts Jesus to attain the rule of a political messiah through idolatry.[40]

Jesus cites Deut. 6.13 and thereby refuses to worship Satan even for the reward of a quick and easy road to messianic rule. Although God's plan involved suffering and death, Jesus is obedient to God's will for his life and ministry. While OT Israel engaged in idolatry when confronted with rivals to the worship of God who demanded exclusive devotion (Deut. 6.10-15; cf. 12.30-31; Exod. 23.23-33), Jesus remained faithful to his Father and his messianic mission.

In the third temptation (4.9-12) the devil, who had twice been defeated by Jesus' use of Scripture, now misuses it for his own purposes. As L.T. Johnson claims, 'The third testing is the most severe, for in it the very support of Jesus' stand is subverted' as the devil tempts Jesus via scriptural support.[41]

By twisting the intended meaning of Ps. 91.11-12,[42] the devil tempts Jesus to perform a spectacular act in front of the Jews—to jump from the pinnacle of the Jerusalem temple[43] and to be miraculously saved by God[44]—and to gain his messiahship by conformity to popular ideas

but subjection to one who is not Jesus' Father'.

39. Here particularly Luke's description is more visionary than Matthew's: Luke does not specify the place to which Jesus was taken (Matthew has 'a very high mountain') and indicates it took place 'in a moment of time'. E. Schweizer, *The Good News according to Luke* (trans. D.E. Green; Atlanta: John Knox, 1984), p. 83, thinks the devil showed Jesus all the kingdoms of the world, including those of past and future.

40. *Pace*, Nolland, *Luke 1–9.20*, p. 180, who does not think that the worship of Satan is involved but simply that Jesus was to gain his messiahship by the way of the world. Similarly, W. Powell, 'The Temptation', *ExpTim* 72 (1961), p. 248. Yet this interpretation obscures Satan's actual words (ἐὰν προσκυνήσῃς ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ) and Jesus' answer from Deut. 6.13. See H. Greeven, 'προσκυνέω', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 763-64.

41. Johnson, *Luke*, p. 76.

42. Although some scholars (e.g., Geldenhuys, *Luke*, p. 162) suggest that Satan's omission of 'in all your ways' from Ps. 91.11-12 is the key to his misuse of the Scripture, the quotation seems to have the same force either way.

43. The location of τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ is uncertain; besides Lk. 4.9 the only other ancient sources to mention it are Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.23.11 and *T. Sol.* 22.8 (πτερύγιον τοῦ ναοῦ) which are probably dependent on the NT. On the theories of the location of the pinnacle and their proponents, see Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 172-73.

44. Johnson, *Luke*, p. 74, notes, 'There is a cunning, implicit *qal wahomer*

rather than by God's plan. A late Jewish midrash, *Pes. R.* 36, that may go back to the NT period and that was sometimes cited in connection with Ps. 91.11, is supportive of this interpretation. It states that 'When the King, the Messiah, reveals himself, he will come and stand on the roof of the temple'.[45] However, if this tradition does not go back to the time of Jesus, there were other claims of extraordinary acts by self-proclaimed prophets in the NT era that support my interpretation (e.g., Josephus *Ant.* 20.5.1 §97; cf. Jn 7.1-3).[46]

By his citation of Deut. 6.16[47] Jesus rejects Satan's suggestion to gain his messiahship through popular acclaim and implicitly chooses God's way to his messiahship. While the Israel of Deut. 6.16 in a crisis over a lack of water at Massah (cf. Exod. 17.1-7) demanded water, threatened to stone Moses, and 'put the Lord to the test' by asking, 'Is the Lord among us or not', Jesus by his obedience to Scripture rejects the idea of testing God.

Narrative Conclusion (v. 13). When the devil had finished every (i.e., every kind of [πάντα]) temptation, he departed from Jesus 'until an opportune time'. In Luke he reappears next in 22.3 to instigate Jesus' passion. But his departure does not mean that there is a 'Satan-free' period in the life of Luke's Jesus from 4.13 until 22.3 as H. Conzelmann proposes, because Satanic opposition and the kind of

(lesser to greater) argument in the devil's citation. If God commands the angels to protect David... how much more would he protect the Messiah who is "God's Son" if he throws himself headlong from the temple.'

45. See, e.g., Ellis, *Luke*, p. 95; and Twelftree, 'Temptation', p. 823. Otherwise: e.g., Manson, *Sayings*, p. 44; Marshall, *Luke*, p. 173; and Stein, *Luke*, p. 148 n. 51, do not think the tradition fits with this account since it says nothing about the messiah leaping. Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 260; and Nolland, *Luke 1–9.20*, p. 181, insist that there is no suggestion of spectators and that it was to be done for Jesus' benefit. Cf. N. Hydahl, 'Die Versuchung auf der Zinne des Tempels', *ST* 15 (1961), pp. 113-27, who contends that Jesus was tempted to submit to the punishment for blasphemy—as a person to be stoned was first thrown down from a high place (*Sanh.* 6.4)—that would not harm him.

46. Another possible facet of this temptation is that the devil is tempting Jesus to challenge God to keep his promise of protection for his children (Exod. 19.4-5; Deut. 28.1-14; 32.10-11), esp. in the temple (Pss. 36.7-9; 91). This view is supported by the devil's quotation of Ps. 91.11-12 and a similar incident in Jn 7.1-7. See Twelftree, 'Temptation', pp. 823-24.

47. Each citation thus far was introduced by γέγραπται (4.4, 8, 10), but after Satan's use of it, Jesus changes to εἴρηται.

temptation found in this narrative are before Jesus throughout Luke's Gospel (cf. 8.12; 10.17-18; 11.14-22; 13.11-17; 22.28).[48]

Unlike Mt. 4.11 and Mk 1.13, Luke has no reference to the ministry of angels to Jesus after the temptation. He pictures Jesus standing alone as the victor over Satan due to his knowledge and obedience to God's word.[49]

A Scripture Debate Commentary Pattern

In the temptation narrative a commentary pattern appears that is quite similar to certain rabbinic Scripture debate patterns, that is, literary expressions of rabbinic disputations in which Scripture quotations form the basis of the discussion. In the rabbinica there are several three-part arguments, in which question and answer are derived from the Scriptures, that are analogous in form to the three-part dispute of Lk. 4.1-13 (e.g., *Sifre* Deut. 307; *b. Sanh.* 89b; *Deut. R.* 11.5).[50]

48. Conzelmann, *Theology*, p. 28. See esp. the critique of Brown, *Apostasy and Perseverance*, pp. 5-19; followed by Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 518. Similarly, Marshall, *Luke*, p. 174. See also F.J. Glendenning, 'The Devil and the Temptations of our Lord according to St Luke', *Theology* 52 (1949), pp. 102-105, who argues that Luke shows that temptation occurred throughout Jesus' ministry (based on 4.13; 22.28). Stein, *Luke*, p. 148, agrees with S. Brown that Satan was active in all of Jesus' ministry, but he thinks the phrase 'left him until an opportune time' suggests that a direct confrontation with the devil did not occur until the time of Jesus' passion.

49. See Marshall, *Luke*, p. 174.

50. Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 254-57, cites *Sifre* Deut. 307, a three-sectioned rabbinic dispute where question and answers are taken from Scripture; cf. *Šeq.* 5.49b, 2; *Sanh.* 43b; *Yom.* 56b; *Tanḥ* בראשית 20 (see Str–B, I, p. 391; II, p. 417; III, pp. 103, 846). H.A. Kelly, 'The Devil in the Desert', *CBQ* 26 (1964), pp. 190-220, furnishes better parallels: (1) *b. Sanh.* 89b, a threefold dispute between Abraham and Satan where they draw questions and answers from the OT; (2) *Deut. R.* 11.5, a three-part Scripture debate between the Angel of Death and Moses that is particularly relevant as the Angel of Death quotes from the Psalms (118.17; 19.2) and Moses gives each of his three responses from Deuteronomy (32.1, 3, 4). For briefer mentions of the similarity to rabbinic debates that do not cite specific texts, see, e.g., B.M.F. van Iersel, *'Der Sohn' in den synoptischen Jesusworten* (Leiden: Brill, 1964), p. 166; K.G. Kuhn, 'New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament', in K. Stendahl (ed.), *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), pp. 111-13; Nolland, *Luke 1–9.20*, p. 177; Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, I, p. 69; and Barrett, *Holy Spirit*, p. 52. For the Jewish background of the scene, see D. Flusser, 'Die Versuchung

Although the literary pattern in Lk. 4.1-13 does not conform to the two most common Jewish commentary patterns (i.e., *proem* and *yelammedenu*) discussed in Chapter 2, it does have affinities with other rabbinic Scripture debate patterns and may be classified as a special type of commentary pattern used in scriptural debates.[51]

Conclusions

The following conclusions characterize Jesus' exposition of Scripture in his temptation experience:

1. In his battle with Satan Jesus employed a literal[52] application of the OT (i.e., without midrashic techniques) in a debate pattern similar to certain rabbinic disputations in which questions and answers are drawn from Scripture.

2. An antithetical Israel–Christ typology is evident in the citations and in the narrative: Jesus as the Son of God remains faithful to God and his messianic mission where Israel, God's OT son, failed to obey him.

3. Scripture is of primary importance for Jesus from the outset of his ministry. (a) The OT is the basis of his understanding of his messianic identity and ministry as the servant-messiah; it is used to reject both Satan's temptations and contemporary Jewish conceptions of the messiah and their interpretations of Scripture. (b) It is also the only weapon Jesus employed in his temptation experience to defeat his supreme opponent, Satan.

4. Scripture is the word of finality for Jesus; there are no further appeals or exegesis after his quotations. Yet there is a correct and an incorrect interpretation of Scripture as Jesus stands by his 'Spirit-led'

Jesu und ihr jüdischer Hintergrund', *Judaica* 45 (1989), pp. 110-28.

51. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 96 n. 69, does not discuss the passage but classifies it as a special midrashic pattern.

52. I have adopted this term from Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 66-67, who states, 'A number of times in the Gospels, Jesus is portrayed as interpreting the Old Testament in a literalist manner, particularly in matters concerned with basic religious and moral values... Likewise, in countering the devil's suggestion in the wilderness, Jesus based his replies on a literal rendering of three deuteronomic passages.' Cf. S.L. Edgar, 'Respect for Context in Quotations from the Old Testament', *NTS* 9 (1962), pp. 55-62, esp. 59-62, who argues that Jesus' interpretation of the OT here and elsewhere is according to the OT's original context. See the reply to Edgar by R.T. Mead, 'A Dissenting Opinion about Respect for the Context of Old Testament Quotations', *NTS* 10 (1964), pp. 279-89.

application of the OT (Lk. 4.1) but rejects the devil's misuse of Ps. 91.11-12.[53]

The Nazareth Sermon (4.16-30)

The Nazareth sermon pericope preserves the NT's sole citation of Isa. 61.1-2 (linked with Isa. 58.6).[54] This pre-Lukan tradition of the Isaiah 61 quotation[55] and subsequent sermon is likely the most important passage in Luke–Acts; it is almost universally held to be programmatic for the two-part work.[56]

53. Two Lukan scholars give fitting comments on this last point: Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, pp. 512-13, says, 'In each of the scenes the devil is vanquished by Jesus, the Son of God, quoting Scripture. No other words of Jesus are recorded (save in Matt 4.10). He is portrayed as the conqueror because he is armed with "the sword of the Spirit, the word of God"... The devil may quote Scripture to his purpose (using Ps. 91.11-12 in Luke 4.10-11), but he does not prove to be the "more powerful one" (3.16; 11.22). Thus, at the very outset of his ministry, Jesus is portrayed as the "more powerful one" standing guard over his Father's plan and obedient to Scripture itself.' Geldenhuys, *Luke*, p. 161, writes, 'Here, as throughout the Gospels, we see how Jesus acknowledges the absolute authority of the Word of God and maintains it as [*sic*] guiding principle of His life as Man. What is written therein gives to Him the final, conclusive answer. So He does not argue with the devil, but again and again repels him unconditionally by means of a single pronouncement from God's Word.'

54. The NA26 appendix lists the following allusions to Isa. 61.1-2 in the NT: Lk. 6.20-21; 7.22; Acts 4.27; 10.38; Mt. 5.3-4; 11.5; Rev. 5.10. It only lists Acts 8.23 as containing an allusion to Isa. 58.6.

55. Isaiah had a tremendous influence on Luke's Gospel which contains more quotations and allusions to Isaiah than any other OT book (i.e., 84 of his 525 OT references according to the NA26 appendix). For studies of Isaiah in Luke and the NT, see J.A. Sanders, 'Isaiah in Luke', *Int* 36 (1982), pp. 144-55; D. Seccombe, 'Luke and Isaiah', *NTS* 27 (1981), pp. 252-59; W.R. Hanford, 'Deutero-Isaiah and Luke–Acts', *CQR* 168 (1967), pp. 141-52; J. Flamming, 'The New Testament Use of Isaiah', *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 11 (1968), pp. 89-103; and H. Songer, 'Isaiah and the New Testament', *RevExp* 65 (1968), pp. 459-70.

56. Despite the agreement on the programmatic nature of the text, scholars disagree on a few other issues which are largely excluded in this work to focus on Jesus' use of the OT. For essays devoted to representative discussions of the critical issues in 4.16-30, see D. Hill, 'The Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (Luke iv 16-30)', *NovT* 13 (1971), pp. 161-80; and H. Anderson, 'Broadening Horizons', *Int* 18 (1964), pp. 259-75. On the source question from which the other issues largely arise, see esp. Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 177-80, and the literature there cited. Also see nn. 57-58.

The historical reliability of the narrative is primarily questioned at two points: its relationship to Mk 6.1-6 and the related issue of an alleged incongruity between Lk. 4.16-22 and 4.23-30.

1. Scholars debate whether the narrative is a Lukan redactional expansion of Mk 6.1-6[57] or whether it comes from Luke's special source of L material because much of the passage is unparalleled in Mk 6.1-6 and because the OT citation is a conflation of two Isaiah texts which has LXX affinities. (a) Several authorities have given convincing evidences that Luke is using his unique L source or other traditional material rather than freely creating the narrative.[58] (b) As I.H. Marshall has shown, Luke was a careful historian who composed his Gospel from accounts that were controlled by his sources rather than from free, theological elaborations.[59] (c) As it has been shown above, an OT quotation's affinities with the LXX do not force one to hold to a redactional creation;[60] as my analysis of the quotation below will show, Luke preserves a mixed text form of this citation rather than a LXX text form.

57. E.g., Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 32-33; Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive*, pp. 143-54; Stendahl, *School*, p. 96; Barrett, 'Luke–Acts', p. 236; Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, pp. 526-27; Creed, *Luke*, pp. 64-66; Evans, *Saint Luke*, pp. 266-75; and R.C. Tannehill, 'The Mission of Jesus according to Luke iv 16-30', in W. Eltester (ed.), *Jesus in Nazareth* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972), p. 66.

58. On the view of Luke's use of L: e.g., Ellis, *Luke*, pp. 95-96; Nolland, *Luke 1–9.20*, pp. 192-94; Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 177-80; Plummer, *Luke*, p. 118; and Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, p. 37. On the view of Luke's combining Mark and L or Q: e.g., H. Schürmann, 'Zur Traditionsgeschichte der Nazareth Perikope Lk. 4,16-30', in A. Descamps and A. de Halleux (eds.), *Mélanges Bibliques* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1970), pp. 187-205; *idem*, *Lukasevangelium*, I, pp. 241-44; *idem*, 'Der "Bericht vom Angang"', *SE* 2 (1964), pp. 242-58; C.M. Tuckett, 'Luke 4,16-30, Isaiah and Q', in J. Delobel (ed.), *Logia* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982), pp. 343-54; and Leaney, *Luke*, pp. 50-54. Cf. C. Masson, 'Jésus à Nazareth', in *Vers les sources d'eau vive* (Lausanne: Librairie Payot, 1961), pp. 38-69, who contends that both Mk 6.1-6 and Lk. 4.16-30 go back to an *Ur*-Mark source except for 4.28-30 which is more original. Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 179-80, offers a summary of many of the views held by the above scholars. Also see D.P. Seccombe, *Possessions and the Poor in Luke–Acts* (Linz: Fuchs, 1983), pp. 44-46, who argues that the view of a Lukan redaction of Mark cannot be plausibly demonstrated for this passage.

59. Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian*.

60. On the LXX form of citations attributed to Jesus, see n. 19.

2. My examination of this text below also shows that there is no true break between vv. 22 and 23. (a) The sudden change in the audience's appraisal of Jesus from praise to murderous rage is not due to a poor Lukan redactional link, but it is due to Jesus' midrash on Isa. 61.1-2 via allusions to Elijah and Elisha in 4.23-27. (b) The passage's conformity to a midrash pattern and its catchword connections further strengthen the view that the account is a unified exposition given by the earthly Jesus.

The Text Form of Lk. 4.18-19

This citation represents one of the most difficult and complex text forms of all the OT quotations in the NT. It may be analyzed as follows:

> [17]καὶ ἐπεδόθη αὐτῷ βιβλίον τοῦ προφήτου Ἡσαΐου καὶ ἀναπτύξας τὸ βιβλίον εὗρεν τὸν τόπον οὗ ἦν γεγραμμένον· [18]πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμὲ οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, ἀπέσταλκέν με, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν, ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει, [19]κηρύξαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν. (Lk.4.17-19)

> [1]πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ, οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με· εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, ἀπέσταλκέν με, ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν. [2]καλέσαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτὸν καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως, παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας. (Isa. 61.1-2 LXX)

> ἀπόστελλε τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει. (Isa. 58.6d LXX)

> [1]רוח אדני יהוה עלי יען משח יהוה אתי
> לבשר ענוים שלחני לחבש לנשברי־לב
> לקרא לשבוים דרור ולאסורים פקח־קוח
> [2]לקרא שנת־רצון ליהוה ויום נקם לאלהינו
> לנחם כל־אבלים
> (Isa. 61.1-2 MT)

> ושלח רצוצים חפשים
> (Isa. 58.6d MT)

The quotation is a conflation of Isa. 61.1a, b, d, 58.6d and 61.2a that omits 61.1c, 2b. It is of a mixed textual tradition, having points of agreement and distinction with the LXX and MT.[61]

61. The significant variations of this citation from the LXX show that Luke has preserved a mixed text form. See France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 252-53;

1. Luke has three differences from both the LXX and the MT: omissions (a) of Isa. 61.1c ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ,[62] and (b) of 61.2b καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως, παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας, and (c) an insertion of Isa. 58.6d, ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει between 61.1 and 2. This insertion is LXX in form except that Luke has ἀποστεῖλαι for LXX ἀπόστελλε, a stylistic alteration to fit in form with the other infinitives in his citation.

2. Luke has one agreement with the MT against the LXX; in 4.19 it has κηρῦξαι for the MT לקרא and LXX κάλεσαι. While the remainder of the citation follows the LXX, Luke seems to be dependent on the MT for this rendering. This is confirmed by Luke's use of κηρῦξαι for לקרא in 4.18 while the LXX also has κηρῦξαι. Although the LXX varied its rendering of the MT, Luke was consistent.

3. Luke has four agreements with the LXX against the MT: (a) κυρίου for אדוני יהוה, (b) οὗ εἵνεκεν for יען, (c) ἔχρισέν με for משח יהוה אתי, and (d) τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν for לאסורים פקח־קוח. The final phrase is difficult due to the uncertainty of the Hebrew, but in consideration of the ambiguity of the MT at this point the LXX and Luke have chosen a valid translation of the MT.[63]

and Bock, *Proclamation*, pp. 105-108, who argue that this fact decisively displays the weakness in the view that the quotation is a Lukan creation and cannot be an authentic saying of Jesus due to its alleged LXX form. However, LXX affinities do not force one to hold to a redactional creation as will be argued above (see n. 19) and will be further argued below (see n. 90). See also the works cited in n. 94.

62. The UBS3 text does not list it as a variant although it is listed as such in the NA26 text. The longer reading, which lacks textual support, is probably an assimilation to the LXX. Yet some think that it originally was in Luke; see the works and discussion in Marshall, *Luke*, p. 182.

63. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 252-53, has a helpful discussion of this difficult phrase. The RSV translates the phrase 'the opening of the prison to those who are bound'. But פקח־קוח, the intensive form of פקח, is always used of opening eyes (except Isa. 42.20 for opening ears) and never of doors or prisons. However, אסור means 'prisoner', 'one bound'. Thus, the MT presents a mixed metaphor. Either פקח־קוח refers to a figurative freeing from dark prison, or אסור is figurative for the blind. While the targum has retained the ambiguity, the LXX chose the latter meaning. The LXX blindness metaphor is supported by Isa. 42.7 which combines the ideas of opening blind eyes and releasing prisoners. Therefore, the LXX followed by Luke preserves at least part of the MT's sense.

An Exegesis of Luke 4.16-27

The Lk. 4.16-30 pericope is surrounded by a context of important events in the life of Jesus. It is preceded by an account of his baptism (3.21-22), his genealogy (3.23-38), his wilderness temptation (4.1-13), and a summary of his prior ministry in Galilee where he was acclaimed for his teaching (4.14-15). The Nazareth sermon, at the heart of which appears the Isaiah quotation, is followed by other descriptions of his miracles and preaching that he did outside Nazareth (4.31-44).

Narrative Setting (v. 16). Luke alone of the Synoptic Gospels refers to Jesus' practice of teaching in the synagogues as habitual (κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ, cf. 4.15),[64] a practice that was later followed by his post-resurrection followers (cf. Acts 13.5, 14; 14.1; 17.10; 18.4, 26; 19.8).

This passage is the oldest extant version of a synagogue service. Documents that describe the services are post-Christian but probably are descriptive of occurrences in the NT era; they characterize the service as follows.[65] After a prayer upon entry, the order included a public confession of the Shema, a prayer, readings from the law and the prophets, a sermon and a benediction. The readers, who also explained the text after the reading, were chosen before the service. Since Luke does not reveal how Jesus was chosen, it seems likely that he was chosen as a visiting rabbi,[66] a practice common in the NT era (cf. Acts 13.15-17; 14.1; 16.13; 17.2, 10, 17; 18.4; 19.8).

64. Jesus' practice of using the synagogue for preaching seems to be the point here rather than merely the synagogue attendance that was expected of devout Jews (so, e.g., Marshall, *Luke*, p. 181; otherwise, e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 530).

65. For discussions of the ancient synagogue service and Scripture readings see Str–B, IV, pp. 154-71; E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (rev. and ed. G. Vermes *et al.*; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979), II, pp. 423-63; B. Reicke, *The New Testament Era* (trans. D.E. Green; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), pp. 119-24; A. Finkel, 'Jesus' Preaching in the Synagogue on the Sabbath (Luke 4.16-28)', *Service International de Documentation Judéo-Chrétien* 17 (1984), pp. 4-10; and C. Perrot, 'The Reading of the Bible in the Ancient Synagogue', in Mulder (ed.), *Mikra*, pp. 137-59. See also Chapter 2, n. 19 on the significance of Jesus' reading and the audience's understanding of Isa. 61.1-2.

66. Otherwise: Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, I, p. 227, thinks that this was the first time that Jesus read in the synagogue and that he did so without invitation, contrary to the custom of the day. See the reply by Marshall, *Luke*, p. 182.

Although there was a fixed lectionary for the law in Jesus' day, scholars debate whether there was one for the prophets at this time. Most authorities argue that the evidence suggests that there was a freedom of choice for the prophetic reading during the NT period, but a few assert that there was a fixed system.[67]

Jesus' Isaiah Reading and his Initial Comments (vv. 17-22). Verse 17 serves as an IF to the citation of Isa. 61.1-2, a formula that is in narrative form due to its literary setting.

It seems likely that Jesus chose the Isaiah 61 reading here since the prophetic reading probably was not fixed in the NT era and since εὗρεν appears to picture that Jesus deliberately chose the text rather than that he read from an assigned reading or from a chance opening.[68] Also, he seems to have specifically chosen Isa. 61.1-2 so that he could give it an ad hoc shaping for exegetical purposes as will be seen in the analysis of the quotation of Lk. 4.18-19 below.

Luke 4.18a πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμὲ οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με. In the NT the anointing of Jesus is only mentioned by Luke (Lk. 4.18; Acts 10.38; 4.27) and Heb. 1.9. Jesus' baptismal anointing conferred the Spirit upon him (Lk. 3.22; cf. 1.35; 2.25; 4.1, 14); this anointing and possession of the Spirit made possible his messianic words and deeds that are described in the rest of the citation. ἔχρισεν, the verbal cognate of χριστός (= Hebrew משיח), certainly has messianic significance here as demonstrated by W.C. van Unnik who aptly asserts that 4.18-19 is primary for understanding the attribution of the 'Christ' title to Jesus.[69]

67. Several have argued persuasively here: e.g., L. Morris, *The New Testament and Jewish Lectionaries* (London: Tyndale Press, 1964); *idem*, 'The Gospels and the Jewish Lectionaries', in France and Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives*, III, pp. 129-51; P. Billerbeck, 'Ein Synagogengottesdienst in Jesu Tagen', *ZNW* 55 (1964), pp. 143-61; L.C. Crockett, 'Luke iv.16-30 and the Jewish Lectionary Cycle', *JJS* 57 (1966), pp. 13-45; and J. Heinemann, 'The Triennial Lectionary Cycle', *JJS* 19 (1968), pp. 41-48. Otherwise: e.g., C. Perrot, 'Luc 4,16-30 et le lecture biblique de l'ancienne Synagogue', *RevScRel* 47 (1973), pp. 324-40; Ellis, *Luke*, p. 97; Bowker, 'Speeches', p. 99 n. 1; Guilding, *Fourth Gospel*; Goulder, *Evangelists' Calendar*; and *idem*, *Luke*.

68. So, e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, pp. 531-32; and Marshall, *Luke*, p. 182. Otherwise: e.g., Ellis, *Luke*, p. 97, thinks ἐπεδόθη means that Jesus read from an assigned reading. Similarly, Schweizer, *Luke*, p. 88.

69. W.C. van Unnik, 'Jesus the Christ', *NTS* 8 (1961), pp. 101-16. Cf.

The remainder of the quotation is a summary of Jesus' message and mission. It contains several Jubilee-year motifs (i.e., allusions to the OT Jubilee ordinance described particularly in Lev. 25)[70] that had taken on eschatological and messianic overtones in the history of Judaism. Thus, in Jesus' appropriation of the text he claims to be the anointed herald of the eschatological Jubilee, that is, the messianic era.[71] That Jesus employed the Isaiah text with an established eschatological and messianic background in first-century Judaism is certain because 11QMelch also used allusions to Isa. 61.1-3 to speak of an eschatological and messianic Jubilee.[72] In 11QMelch the Qumran sectarians spoke of themselves as *the* community of the eschaton, the tenth and final Jubilee.

However, it is unwarranted to see Jesus bringing in a literal Jubilee year with all its social and economic stipulations[73] or to find the year

Johnson, *Luke*, p. 79. For a study of the uses of messiah in the Jewish writings of the NT era (100 BC–AD 70), see M. de Jonge, 'The Use of the Word "Anointed" in the Time of Jesus', *NovT* 8 (1966), pp. 132-48, who discusses: *Pss. Sol.* 17.32; 18.5, 7; 4QPatr 3; 1QSa 2.14, 20; 1QS 9.11; CD 2.12; 12.23-24; 14.19; 19.10-11; 11QMelch 18; 1QM 11.7; *1 En.* 48.10; 52.4; and mentions the following dated c. AD 100: *4 Ezra* 12.32; *2 Bar.* 29.3; 30.1.

70. See, e.g., J.D.W. Watts, *Isaiah 34–66* (WBC; Dallas: Word Books, 1987), pp. 302-303; and C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66* (OTL; trans. D.M.G. Walker; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), pp. 365-67.

71. The major work on the Jubilee themes in Luke is Sloan, *Favorable Year* (summarized in Chapter 1). Cf. S. Ringe, 'The Jubilee Proclamation in the Ministry of Jesus' (PhD dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1981); *idem*, *Jesus, Liberation, and the Biblical Jubilee* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985); and J.A. Sanders, 'From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), I, pp. 75-106.

72. The first to see allusions to Isa. 61.1-3 in 11QMelch was M.P. Miller, 'The Function of Isaiah 61.1-2 in 11QMelchizedek', *JBL* 88 (1969), pp. 467-69. His work has been built on by J.A. Sanders, 'The Old Testament in 11QMelchizedek', *JANESCU* 5 (1973), pp. 373-82; and *idem*, 'From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4', pp. 90-92. While Miller saw allusions to Isa. 61.1-3 in lines 4, 6, 9, 13 and 18, Sanders found additional ones in lines 14, 19-20. For other important essays on 11QMelch, see J.A. Fitzmyer, 'Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11', *JBL* 86 (1967), pp. 25-41, for the Hebrew text, an English translation, and an exegesis; and Sanders, 'Old Testament in 11QMelch', for earlier works on 11QMelch and a corrected translation with OT allusions listed in the margin.

73. *Pace* A. Trocmé, *Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution* (trans. M.H. Shank and M.E. Miller; Scottsdale: Herald, 1973), pp. 27-40; and J.H. Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), pp. 34-77. See the criticism of

of his sermon to be an actual Jubilee year on the Jewish calendar[74] since there is no evidence that the Jews ever practiced this ordinance[75] and since Jesus' ministry brought an eschatological redemption rather than a social and political reform as supposed by liberation theology.

Luke 4.18b εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, ἀπέσταλκέν με, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν. The first function of this OT figure that Jesus fulfills is preaching good news to the poor; this is a fitting summary of his ministry, which is explained by the subsequent infinitival phrases of the Isaiah citation. It is uncertain to what extent one should take the poor, captives, blind and oppressed as figurative or literal; the poor and blind are mentioned later in Luke in a literal (7.21-22; 14.13, 21; 16.20, 22; 18.22, 35; 19.8; 21.3) and possibly in a figurative manner (6.20, 39; 7.22; 14.13, 21; cf. Acts 26.18), while the captives and oppressed do not appear again. Since Jesus makes a literal application in Lk. 7.21 in allusion to this verse, the literal interpretation cannot be completely rejected.[76]

Luke 4.18c ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει. This phrase is an insertion from Isa. 58.6d 'sandwiched' between Isa. 61.1 and 2. The reason for the conflation has not been obvious to many scholars, and there is considerable disagreement among them.[77] The major

Sloan, *Favorable Year*, pp. 166-94; and M. Rodgers, 'Luke 4.16-30—A Call for a Jubilee Year?', *RTR* 40 (1981), pp. 72-82. Cf. the social emphases without the Jubilee theme of R. Albertz, 'Die "Antrittspredigt" Jesu im Lukasevangelium auf ihrem alttestamentlichen Hintergrund', *ZNW* 74 (1983), pp. 182-206; and W. Dietrich, '"... den Armen das Evangelium verkünden"', *TZ* 41 (1985), pp. 31-43.

74. *Pace* A. Strobel, 'Die Ausrufung des Jobeljahres in der Nazarethpredigt Jesus', in W. Eltester (ed.), *Jesus in Nazareth* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972), pp. 38-50; and *idem*, 'Das apokalyptische Terminproblem in der sogenannte Antrittspredigt Jesus (Lk 4,16-30)', *TLZ* 92 (1967), pp. 251-54, who argues that there was a chronological parallel between Jesus' sermon and a historical Jubilee year (AD 26–27) and that Jesus used the year to gain a background of eschatological expectation. See the criticism of Marshall, *Luke*, p. 184.

75. Watts, *Isaiah 34–66*, p. 303, contends that there is no evidence that Israel ever practiced the ordinance although the prophets used its imagery (e.g., Jer. 34.8-17).

76. Nolland, *Luke 1–9.20*, p. 197, is helpful here, and the above references were taken from his discussion. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 183-84, who favors a metaphorical interpretation for all the phrases. Similarly, Ellis, *Luke*, p. 97, says the terms refer to the righteous remnant of the nation.

77. E.g., France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, p. 134 n. 209, claims 'the insertion of the phrase from Isa. 58.6 has not been satisfactorily explained'.

views on how and why 58.6d was inserted are the following:

1. It is an error due to Luke's faulty memory.[78]
2. There is no reason for its inclusion.[79]
3. It is a substitution for Isa. 61.1c to maintain a chiastic parallelism.[80]
4. It could not have been made in a synagogue reading, and the form is an example of early Christian exegesis that adapted Scripture for theological purposes.[81]
5. It as an early Christian testimony text.[82]

Three suggestions merit more detailed discussion since they advocate a midrashic joining of the Isaianic verses. First, L.C. Crockett proposes that it provides a link with the wider OT contexts (i.e., Isa. 58.7; 61.6) to set forth a messianic banquet theme. He ignores the more obvious word link (ἄφεσις) in Luke and argues that Luke used the technique of enriching[83] to perform a midrash based on πτωχός from LXX Isa. 61.1-6 to stress a messianic banquet motif. He thinks that Isa. 61.6 ('eat the wealth of the nations'), which he contends is a messianic banquet allusion, and 58.7 ('share the bread with the hungry and bring the homeless poor into your house') are behind the conflation of the texts in Luke. Therefore, he alleges that Jesus was sent to announce the messianic banquet. This must be rejected because neither of his key verses and neither part of his alleged catchword

Similarly, Geldenhuys, *Luke*, p. 170 n. 5.

78. E.g., A. Schlatter, *Das Evangelium des Lukas* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 3rd edn, 1975), pp. 226-27; Plummer, *Luke*, pp. 120-22; Ringgren, 'Luke's Use of the Old Testament', p. 229; Anderson, 'Broadening', pp. 259-75; followed by Hill, 'Rejection', p. 165; and M. Hooker at a Southern Methodist University colloquium (Dallas, May 1989).

79. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 184; and Holtz, *Zitate bei Lukas*, pp. 39-41.

80. N.W. Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1942), pp. 236-38, finds both the omissions and this insertion were done to maintain a chiastic form and argues these were present in Luke's source. Cf. H.J.B. Combrink, 'The Structure and Significance of Luke 4.16-30', *Neot* 7 (1973), pp. 34-36; and Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive*, pp. 144-46, who are similar but attribute the changes to Luke.

81. Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 269. But he gives no indication of what the theological purpose might be.

82. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, pp. 52-53.

83. As defined by Gertner, 'Midrashim in the New Testament', pp. 267-92.

midrash on πτωχός (61.1; 58.7) appear in Lk. 4.18-19 while the verses present in Luke clearly are combined by ἄφεσις (as will be discussed below), and the Jubilee year rather than the messianic banquet has been shown to be the OT motif in the Isaiah text and in Jesus' appropriation of it.[84]

Secondly, two scholars assert that it was not the actual synagogue reading but a (pre-)Lukan summary of a larger set of Hebrew texts read by Jesus that day. D.L. Bock contends that it is possible that a Semitic midrash originally linked a larger set of Hebrew texts, that is, the presence of שלח in Isa. 61.1 and 58.6 or possibly רצון in 61.2 and 58.5 provided the original links in a Semitic context. These seem unlikely since שלח is not behind the Greek word link (ἄφεσις) in Luke, and since 58.5 is not present in Luke. Bock seems to opt for the Semitic midrash due to the supposition that a Greek midrash would force one to hold to a Lukan creation, but a Greek form does not mean that the text is an editorial creation as has been shown above.[85]

Similarly, D.P. Seccombe sees the texts midrashically joined on the basis of the greater OT context to stress an '*acceptable* time' of 58.5; 61.2. He thinks that the texts were brought together on the basis of δεκτός/רצון (Isa. 61.2 ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν/שנת־רצון ליהוה; 58.5 νηστείαν δεκτήν/ויום רצון ליהוה) as an alternative to the catchword present in Lk. 4.18-19 (ἄφεσις) for the purpose of stressing the year of the Lord's favor.[86] Although this may be possible, it is somewhat speculative. Since Isa. 58.5 does not occur in Lk. 4.18-19, it is best to stress the catchword (ἄφεσις) present in Luke. Yet if a Semitic original must be seen, the suggestions of Bock and Seccombe merit consideration since it is possible that the text form only represents a summary of Jesus' actual quotation.

Thirdly, several authorities think that it is an insertion connected to Isa. 61.1-2 on the basis of the common Greek word ἄφεσις.[87] This

84. Crockett, 'OT in Luke', pp. 68-75, 280-82.

85. Bock, *Proclamation*, pp. 106-107.

86. Seccombe, *Possessions*, pp. 46-52.

87. Although several deal with the linking of the texts based on the catchword ἄφεσις, only B.J. Koet, '"Today this Scripture has been Fulfilled in Your Ears"', *Bijdragen* 47 (1986), pp. 372-73, mentions the *gezerah shawah* technique (discussed below) underlying this insertion. Others refer to the catchword without the midrashic emphasis: e.g., Sloan, *Favorable Year*, pp. 39-40; Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 532; P.D. Miller, Jr, 'An Exposition of Luke 4.16-21', *Int* 29 (1975),

suggestion seems to be the best one considerating the first-century Jewish exegetical milieu and the Lukan text form as will be developed below.

In Jesus' day the *gezerah shawah* technique (i.e., the joining of two texts based on a common catchword) was frequently used by Jewish theologians to connect two verses from different literary contexts,[88] as was done here: κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν (61.1d); ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει (58.6d). In Lk. 4.18 the fusing of the Greek texts was done on the basis of ἄφεσις which appears in Isa. 61.1d and 58.6d and which provided the link to join the two texts. Since the Hebrew words corresponding to ἄφεσις are different (דרור and חפשים), the joining of these two texts was only possible on the basis of a Greek text. The insertion of Isa. 58.6d also helps to explain the omission of 61.1c which seems to have been omitted to enhance the parallelism between ἄφεσιν and ἀφέσει and to emphasize this term. Furthermore, the *gezerah shawah* technique used here has produced an implicit midrash, that is, an interpretive alteration of the text for exegetical purposes.[89]

Although this midrashic fusion of the two Isaiah verses is only possible with the Greek text, this does not force one to hold to a (pre-) Lukan summary of the Isaiah texts that Jesus read or even to a Lukan creation. Several studies on the languages of Palestine and Jesus suggest that he could speak Greek along with Aramaic and Hebrew.[90]

pp. 417-21; and Sanders, 'From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4', who has done the most thorough midrashic study on this passage, but he emphasizes the hermeneutical axioms (i.e., presuppositions) present in the text and plays down the importance of the hermeneutical principles.

88. For a list, discussion and illustrations of the *gezerah shawah* and the other *middoth* see the section in Chapter 2 on Hillel's exegetical rules and the works there cited.

89. For further explanation and examples of implicit midrash, see my discussion in Chapter 2. See also Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 95-96, who notes that interpretive alterations of OT quotations are the most common type of implicit midrash in the NT and that they are frequently used in explicit midrash patterns. For the practice of combined quotations in the rabbis and the NT, see Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 91; *idem*, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 150; and *idem*, 'Quotations', pp. 22-23.

90. E.g., J.N. Sevenster, *Do you Know Greek?* (trans. J. De Bruin; Leiden: Brill, 1968); A.W. Argyle, 'Did Jesus Speak Greek?' *ExpTim* 67 (1955-56), pp. 92-93, 383; R.H. Gundry, 'The Language Milieu of first-Century Palestine',

Therefore, Jesus could have quoted the text in Greek in an actual sermon and been the originator of the midrashic links present in the quotation and sermon, although it is also possible that the verses could have been joined in the process of summarizing or transmitting this tradition.

Some have argued that because of the conflation of the two texts and the rabbinic prohibition against scrolling back in texts, this could not have possibly been the form of Jesus' actual synagogue reading.[91] But B. Reicke is certainly correct that, because of Jesus' authority as a prophet, he was able to scroll backward and give this type of reading to make his theological point.[92] Yet the conflated form of 4.18-19 suggests the likelihood that it was not the form of Jesus' prophetic reading but one of the later texts of his sermon. That is, the Isa. 58.6d insertion between 61.1-2 was due to the Jewish practice of stringing texts together on the basis of catchwords in forming a sermon.[93]

JBL 83 (1964), pp. 404-408; *idem, Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, pp. 174-78; J.A. Fitzmyer, 'The Languages of Palestine in the First Century AD', *CBQ* 32 (1970), pp. 501-31; P.E. Hughes, 'The Languages Spoken by Jesus', in R.N. Longenecker and M.C. Tenney (eds.), *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979), pp. 127-43; and W.O. Wise, 'Languages of Palestine', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 434-44. On the Greek text form of Jesus' OT citations, see, e.g., nn. 18-19 above; France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 25-26; Moo, *Old Testament in Passion Narratives*, pp. 44-48; and esp. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 63-66, who finds it likely that Jesus spoke Aramaic, Greek and Hebrew and that he was sometimes the originator of the LXX features of his OT quotations. He argues that Isa. 61.1-2 in Lk. 4.18-19 is the foremost example of this since this mixed text form is beyond any other explanation. Cf. Horton, 'Reflections on the Semitisms of Luke–Acts'; Turner, 'The Quality of the Greek in Luke–Acts'; and Black, 'Second Thoughts IX', who speak of a special synagogue Greek used by ancient Jews.

91. E.g., Stendahl, *School*, p. 96, citing *b. Meg.* 24a.

92. B. Reicke, 'Jesus in Nazareth', in H. Balz and S. Schulz (eds.), *Das Wort und die Wörter* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973), pp. 48-49; followed by Sloan, *Favorable Year*, p. 39.

93. C.H. Cave, 'The Sermon at Nazareth and the Beatitudes in Light of the Synagogue Lectionary', *SE* 3 (1964), p. 232, contends that Luke's account indicates Jesus read the *haftarah* from Isa. 61, but thus explains the insertion of Isa. 58.6d in Lk. 4.18-19: Lk. 4.18-19 does not record the *haftarah* but the text of Jesus' sermon. Rather 'the Haphtarah formed the background of the Midrash, and the text upon which the exposition depended was drawn from it. The intrusion of Isa. 58 may be accounted for by the common method of preaching which strung

The unique text form caused by the insertion of 58.6d between 61.1 and 2 is evidence for the authenticity of the citation on the lips of Jesus.[94] Several factors support this conclusion: (1) The insertion of one text between another is not paralleled elsewhere in the Gospels or Acts, (2) the linking of these verses does not appear in other Jewish expository literature,[95] and (3) the merging of citations is also rare in other Jewish documents.[96]

The midrashic connecting of the texts that was done on the basis of ἄφεσις is significant since ἄφεσις, the foremost Jubilee term in the passage according to R.B. Sloan,[97] translates the primary OT Jubilee terms שמטה ('liberation') in Deuteronomy 15, דרור ('release', the Hebrew word behind ἄφεσις in 61.1) and יובל ('year of Jubilee') in Leviticus 25, 27. The joining of the texts by Jesus is also apropos because Isaiah 61, to which Isa. 58.6 is closely related in its OT context,[98] is composed of Jubilee traditions.

together like pearls passages illustrative of each other.' I agree with this supposition although I question his views on the synagogue lectionary and the content of Jesus' sermon (i.e., it consisted of the Lukan form of the beatitudes and woes). See n. 67 for works that critique the lectionary hypothesis, n. 115 on Cave's supposition on the content of the sermon, and ch. 2 on the form of midrashic homilies. A similar, more recent proponent of the view that Lk. 4.18-19 does not record the *haftarah* but the text of Jesus' sermon is D. Monshouwer, 'The Reading of the Prophet in the Synagogue at Nazareth', *Bib* 72 (1991), pp. 90-99, who argues that the account is a Lukan creation and Luke's Gospel was a Christian lectionary.

94. See B. Chilton, 'Announcement in Nazara', in France and Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives*, II, pp. 147-72, who asserts that Jesus' alteration of the text is the only good reason for its preservation in this form. Similarly, Tuckett, 'Luke 4,16-30', pp. 347-48; Sanders, 'From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4', pp. 100-101; and Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 65-66.

95. Although Isa. 61.1-2 appears several times in the Jewish literature (*Zohar* 2.136b; *Mek.* to Exod. 20.21; *'Abod Zar.* 20b; *Lev. R.* 10.2; *Midr. Ekah* 3.50; *Targ. Ps.-J.* to Num. 25.12; *Targ.* Jonathan to Isa. 61.1-2; 1QIs^{a+b} 61.1-2; 1QH 18.14-15; 4QpPs37 2.9-10; 1QS 9.21-23; 1QM 7.4-5; 11QMelch 4, 6, 9, 13, 14, 18-20; *Barn.* 14.9), it never appears in the Lukan form. See Sanders, 'From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4', for a complete tradition history of Isa. 61.1-3 in the Jewish literature and the NT.

96. Ellis, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 150, n. 18; and *idem*, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 91.

97. Sloan, *Favorable Year*, pp. 36-39.

98. On the recognition of the close relationship of these Isaiah texts, see, e.g., Watts, *Isaiah 34–66*, pp. 302-303; and Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66*, p. 337.

In the linking of these texts, Jesus defined his ministry in terms of OT prophecy and fulfillment: he cited Isa. 61.1-2 to claim that he was the herald who proclaimed the messianic release[99] and inserted Isa. 58.6d to emphasize that he was also the agent of this spiritual liberation.

Luke 4.19 κηρύξαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν. The announcement of the era of the Lord's salvation that Jesus brings also has obvious Jubilee links, which he uses typologically.[100] His message emphasized deliverance, primarily in the sense of release from sins through salvation, in the eschatological age of the messiah. And his proclamation of 4.18-19 has been classified as the form of the Lukan kerygma.[101]

In 4.19 Jesus only quotes Isa. 61.2a and thereby leaves out the phrase on God's vengeance on his enemies of 61.2b since judgment was not an emphasis of his earthly ministry.[102] That Jesus stopped on δεκτόν is also important for its link to the later occurrence of δεκτός

99. See D.E. Aune, 'A Note on Jesus' Messianic Consciousness and 11QMelchizedek', *EvQ* 45 (1973), pp. 161-65, who (1) argues from 11QMelch that Jesus saw himself as the messiah against the classical form critical view that Jesus' messiahship was created by the post-resurrection church and (2) finds 11QMelch 18, which *peshers* Isa. 52.7, to be the first piece of conclusive pre-70 evidence that the proclamation of good news was an essential aspect of the messianic task. See also Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 530.

100. Sloan, *Favorable Year*, pp. 32-36, has an excellent discussion here and sees this as a summary of 4.18. See also n. 71. Cf. R. Bultmann, 'ἀφίημι κτλ.', *TDNT*, I, p. 511, who claims ἄφεσις is here used in its normal Christian sense of forgiveness. More tentatively, Marshall, *Luke*, p. 184.

101. O. Betz, 'The Kerygma of Jesus', *Int* 22 (1968), pp. 131-46, contends that 4.18-19 is the kerygma of Jesus and that Luke's Jesus did not preach a call to repentance but a realized eschatology. Similarly, Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 533, claims this is the form of the Lukan kerygma in contrast to Mk 1.14-15.

102. J. Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations* (Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1958), pp. 44-46, alleges this omission is the reason for the crowd's rage: Jesus left out the phrase they saw referring to messianic vengeance on the Gentiles. He builds on B. Violet, 'Zum rechten Verständnis der Nazareth-Perikope Lc 4.16-30', *ZNW* 37 (1938), pp. 251-71. Jeremias is followed by H. Baarlink, 'Ein gnädiges Jahr des Herrn—und Tage der Vergeltung', *ZNW* 73 (1982), pp. 204-20. Similarly, Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 271, says that Luke may have stopped here 'to underline the gracious aspect of Jesus' ministry, avoiding here the aspect of divine judgment'. Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 532, proposes that the omission is 'a deliberate suppression of a negative aspect of the Deutero-Isaian message'. See also Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 103 n. 99.

in the proverb of 4.24 (οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ). He ended his citation on δεκτόν to enable him to make another rhetorical/midrashic point in 4.24 by the common Jewish practice of linking key words in the sermon to the original Scripture text.[103]

Before leaving the quotation, the figure in mind in Jesus' appropriation of this text merits consideration since it is an issue of debate. The following figures have been proposed:

1. The final eschatological prophet like Moses[104]
2. The messiah[105]
3. A combination of the eschatological prophet and the messiah[106]
4. A combination of the final prophet and the servant of the Lord[107]

103. For helpful discussions on this point, see Sanders, 'From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4', pp. 98-103, who is the only one to call this word tally a *gezerah shawah* (followed by Sloan, *Favorable Year*, pp. 32-33). For others who recognize the use of the catchword although they do not deal with midrash in any detail, see, e.g., Nolland, *Luke 1–9.20*, p. 200; Tannehill, 'Mission', p. 57; Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 537; Hill, 'Rejection', pp. 168-70; and Johnson, *Luke*, pp. 79-80. Otherwise: Koet, 'Today', p. 373, who finds no *gezerah shawah* here.

104. Several object to the view that Jesus is portrayed as the messiah here and argue for the eschatological prophet instead. E.g., F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology* (trans. H. Knight and G. Ogg; New York: World, 1963), pp. 381-82, is against messiah due to no mention of the title χριστός. Similarly, Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, pp. 529-30. A. Finkel, 'Jesus' Sermon at Nazareth', in O. Betz *et al.* (eds.), *Abraham unser Vater* (Leiden: Brill, 1963), p. 106, posits that this passage shows Jesus to be a prophet with the dual task of teaching and healing. Similarly, Barrett, 'Luke/Acts', p. 236. Cf. M.B. Turner, 'Jesus and the Spirit in Lucan Perspective', *TynBul* 32 (1981), pp. 3-42, who contends that there was no connection between the anointing with the Spirit and Jesus as the Davidic messiah and classifies the OT quotation as a *pesher* that depicts Jesus as the eschatological prophet like Moses (in messianic terms).

105. E.g., Tannehill, 'Mission', p. 69; van Unnik, 'Jesus', pp. 101-16; and Leaney, *Luke*, p. 118.

106. E.g., Nolland, *Luke 1–9.20*, p. 196; and Johnson, *Luke*, pp. 80-82.

107. E.g., Franklin, *Christ the Lord*, 61-64. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 183, who thinks that the passage describes the functions of a prophetic figure, possibly interpreted in terms of the Servant of Yahweh, rather than an identification of the messiah, but he writes, 'Ultimately, the concepts of the eschatological prophet and the Messiah merge'.

5. A combination of all three figures: the messiah, the servant and the final prophet.[108]

The fusing of the three figures in the person of Jesus should be accepted for the following reasons: (1) The final eschatological prophet is more than evident because (a) of the reference to a prophet in 4.24, (b) of the Elijah/Elisha mention of 4.25-27, and (c) of Isa. 61.1's reference to an anointing which may be an anointing of the prophet pictured as the Servant. (2) The messiah is apparent because: (a) Jesus received an eschatological anointing at his baptism for a messianic task, (b) the Isa. 58.6 insertion stresses a ministry of actual deliverance added to the proclamation of it (i.e., the figures of a herald [61.1-2] and a deliverer [58.6] are joined), and (c) the prior events—the baptism and the temptation—in this context are strongly messianic in character as are his subsequent works of healing in 4.37-41. (3) The servant of Yahweh also is in mind (a) since Jesus and the herald of Isaiah both speak of the servant (or at least a figure in the servant's role) and (b) since Isa. 61.1-3 is likely a servant song or at least a midrash on the earlier songs.[109]

The phrase σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶν ὑμῶν (4.21) is akin to a midrashic *pesher* formula. A similar *pesher* (פשר) formula ('the interpretation [פשר] is...') was frequently used at Qumran to introduce an interpretation after a Scripture citation.[110] Although Qumran's formula was used to serve its eschatological perspective, the *pesher*-like formula is employed by Jesus here[111] in a

108. Bock, *Proclamation*, pp. 108-11, *passim*, in his study on Lukan OT Christology shows that Luke has the habit of combining christological portraits. See also, e.g., France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 132-35; Ellis; *Luke*, p. 97; Sloan, *Favorable Year*, pp. 44-73; and W.W. Klein, 'The Sermon at Nazareth (Luke 4.14-22)', in K.W.M. Wozniak and S.J. Grenz (eds.), *Christian Freedom* (New York: University Press of America, 1986), pp. 153-72.

109. E.g., Ellis, *Luke*, p. 97, sees the Servant as the figure in Isaiah and Jesus taking on this role. Sanders, 'From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4', pp. 80-83, thinks Isa. 61.1-3 is a midrash on earlier Servant songs.

110. E.g., 1QpHab 12.6-7; 4QFlor 1.11-14. For a discussion of this formula and further examples see the sections in Chapter 2 on other exegetical terminology and midrash at Qumran and the works there cited. Cf. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 70-75, who claims that the *pesher* motif of interpretation (i.e., a 'this is that' fulfillment motif) was Jesus' most common use of the OT.

111. While in Mk 1.15 Jesus announces that 'the time is fulfilled' in his proclamation of the kingdom, Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, p. 534, succinctly observes, 'in Luke

more heightened eschatological sense in the perfect tense for a claim of present fulfillment that is nowhere paralleled in other Jewish literature.[112] Furthermore, Jesus' formula has σήμερον in the emphatic position to show that he was claiming fulfillment and the beginning of the eschatological era the very moment he cited the prophecy.[113]

Many NT scholars take 4.21 to be the summary of Jesus' entire sermon that Luke has left unrecorded rather than a formula that introduces his interpretation given in 4.22-27.[114] A. Finkel, one of the few to speculate on the content of the supposedly unrecorded sermon, contends that the beatitudes, which Luke did not reproduce here, originally followed the *pesher* statement of 4.21.[115] Several considerations make these suppositions unlikely: (1) ἤρξατο suggests that 4.21 is the beginning of a sermon that follows rather than a mere summary of it. (2) Jewish midrashic/homily patterns usually follow an interpretive formula with exposition or discussion and further OT references, both of which are included in this passage (see the next section). (3) Finkel's supposition on the beatitudes is speculative, is unlikely considering the crowd's reaction in 4.28-30, and neglects the further exposition in 4.22-27. Therefore, it is more likely that after

it is the Scripture that sees its fulfillment. This is part of the way he reads the OT, making out of much of it—sometimes even passages that are not even prophetic (in the OT sense)—predictions, which are now being realized.' See also Sanders, 'From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4', pp. 96-97.

112. Fitzmyer, 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Literature and in the New Testament', pp. 297-33; and Metzger, 'The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah', pp. 297-307, after studying all the IF, both conclude that the NT fulfillment formula is not paralleled in other Jewish expository literature.

113. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, p. 150, characterizes the eschatological force of the statement: 'The Messiah is, by definition, an eschatological figure, and Jesus is the Messiah. Thus in his coming the eschaton has arrived. This is the point of Jesus declaration concerning Isaiah 61.1-2.' See also E. Fuchs, 'σήμερον', *TDNT*, VII, p. 274.

114. E.g., Nolland, *Luke, 1–9.20*, p. 196; Stein, *Luke*, p. 157; and Geldenhuys, *Luke*, p. 168.

115. Finkel, *Teacher of Nazareth*, pp. 155-58; and *idem*, 'Jesus' Sermon at Nazareth', pp. 106-15, argues (1) that the allusions to Isa. 61.1-7 in Mt. 5.3-12 and Lk. 6.20-23 are the basis of the beatitudes and (2) that since Isa. 61.1-2 is used in Lk. 4.18-19 and the sermon is not recorded, the beatitudes must have followed for the content of the sermon. Cf. Cave, 'Sermon at Nazareth', pp. 231-35, who is similar but focuses his discussion on a lectionary hypothesis.

the fulfillment claim of 4.21, we possess a compact summary of the conclusion of Jesus' sermon in 4.23-27.

Jesus' Concluding Comments (vv. 23-27). In 4.23-24 Jesus replies to the crowd's skeptical response to his initial comments by quoting a proverb that explains their rejection of him: οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ.[116] In 4.19 he ended his citation of Isa. 61.2 on δεκτόν, and here his proverb also uses δεκτός as a key word. Thus, in his rebuke of the crowd he uses the catchword δεκτός to refer back to this familiar OT verse. As was the common Jewish practice of his day, Jesus joins comments in his exposition (here in the form of a dialogue) to his original Scripture text by a catchword. Although the parallel proverb in Matthew and Mark have ἄτιμος, Lk. 4.24 is unique with δεκτός (cf. Acts 10.38; *Pap. Oxy.* 1.6; *Gos. Thom.* 31).

In 4.25-27 Jesus compares his ministry to the ministries of Elijah and Elisha (by allusions to 1 Kgs 17.1, 8-16; 18.1; 2 Kgs 5.1-14) to conclude his Nazareth sermon. He refers to incidents in the lives of Elijah and Elisha when they ministered outside Israel: Elijah helped a widow from Zarephath, and Elisha healed Naaman, a leper from Syria, despite the fact that there were many widows and lepers in Israel.

It is not the audience's realization that Jesus was Joseph's son (v. 22) that brings the crowd's rage and attempt to kill Jesus (vv. 28-30). Instead, it is Jesus' Elijah/Elisha allusions used in his commentary on Isaiah 61 that enrages the crowd because he suggests that the blessings of the messiah's ministry will be extended to the enemies of Israel. J.A. Sanders elucidates this difficult passage with the help of 11QMelch which also quoted Isa. 61.1-2 (along with Isa. 52.7; Lev. 25.13) to forecast an eschatological era of Jubilee. He points out that Jesus and 11QMelch differ in the exegesis of this passage. Unlike Jesus, 11QMelch emphasized judgment and the very line that Jesus omitted (the day of vengeance of our God, Isa. 61.2a) as a word of eschatological judgment against Israel's enemies; this is how Jesus' audience likely understood the passage. When Jesus commented on Isa. 61.1-2, his audience expected blessings for them and judgment

116. This proverb is one of six amen sayings in Luke: 4.24; 12.37; 13.17; 18.29-30; 21.32; 23.43. See J.C. O'Neill, 'The Six Amen Sayings in Luke', *JTS* 10 (1959), pp. 1-9.

for their enemies. Consequently, they could not accept his extension of the blessings of the messiah to all people.[117] This exegetical insight shows that there is no unexplainable break between vv. 22 and 23 as is often alleged; rather the audience's unanticipated change from praising Jesus to their attempt to kill him is aptly explained by his unexpected midrash on Isa. 61.1-2 via allusions to Elijah and Elisha.

These Elijah/Elisha allusions also foreshadow both the Jews' continued rejection of Jesus and the church's ministry in Acts (i.e., the Gentile mission), thus the programmatic nature of the narrative.[118] Therefore, they not only picture Jesus' ministry as antitypical to these experiences of Elijah and Elisha[119] but also give a justification from the OT for the Gentile mission.

117. Sanders, 'From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4', pp. 92-95, offers a convincing argument: the crowd was pleased and puzzled at Jesus' words in 4.22, but they became angry in 4.28-29 because of his midrash on Isa. 61 (4.25-27) that implied the inclusion of the Gentiles in the messianic era. He stresses that Jesus was not acceptable to his people because of differing hermeneutical axioms (presuppositions); that is, Jesus challenged the current interpretation of the day through a hermeneutical axiom of prophetic critique which his hearers opposed. Sanders rightly sees this midrash as bringing unity to the narrative in refutation of those who see the account as disjointed (e.g., Leaney, *Luke*, pp. 50-54). See also Evans, *Noncanonical Writings*, pp. 178-79, who appears to follow Sanders. Cf. J.D.M. Derrett, *New Resolutions of Old Conundrums* (Warwickshire: Drinkwater, 1986), pp. 111-22, who also traces the crowd's reaction to the mention of Elijah and Elisha's ministry to Gentiles but denies the historicity of v. 29. Similarly, Schweizer, *Luke*, pp. 87-91.

118. *Pace* R.L. Brawley, *Luke–Acts and the Jews* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), pp. 6-27; and W. Schmeichel, 'Christian Prophecy in Lukan Thought', in G. MacRae (ed.), *SBL 1976 Seminar Papers* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976), pp. 293-304, who object that this is not programmatic of the Gentile mission. Crockett, 'Old Testament in Luke'; and *idem*, 'Luke 4.25-27 and Jewish Gentile Relations in Luke–Acts', sees a messianic banquet motif in mind that emphasizes the table fellowship of Jews and Gentiles because Elijah was fed by a Gentile widow (I critiqued this view above). Koet, 'Today', pp. 382-94, thinks that the prophets were mentioned to inspire Israel to convert and that the Gentiles are saved along with Israel. Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 275, claims that these illustrations do not fit here nor suggest the Gentile mission.

119. On the use of the Elijah and Elisha typology in Luke (cf. 7.11-17; 9.52-55, 61-62) and the NT, see, e.g., D.L. Bock, 'Elijah and Elisha', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 203-206; C.A. Evans, 'Luke's Use of the Elijah/Elisha Narratives and the Ethics of Election', *JBL* 106 (1987), pp. 75-83; and France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 48, 75-77.

A Proem-like Commentary Pattern

Jesus' sermon in Lk. 4.17-27 has close affinities to the rabbinic *proem* pattern,[120] an expository pattern that the rabbis used in their synagogue ministries and one of the two major types of explicit midrash (i.e., biblical text plus commentary) discussed in Chapter 2.[121] It has similarities both in form and in the practice of linking Scripture texts and sermon comments by catchwords. Thus, it may be classified as a *proem*-like pattern and analyzed as follows:

1. Verses 18-19: initial texts (Isa. 61.1-2; 58.6) linked by ἄφεσις[122]
2. Verses 20-24: exposition via a *pesher*-like statement, discussion and a proverb with the verbal link δεκτός to Isa. 61.2
3. Verses 25-27: concluding texts in the form of allusions (1 Kgs 17.1, 8-16; 18.1; 2 Kgs 5.1-14)

This pattern does possess minor differences from the form generally found in the rabbinic homily collections: the closing text does not repeat or allude to the initial texts[123] and the pattern is less stereotypical and detailed than the later rabbinic patterns. Yet it evidences a common root.[124] The differences are typical of other exegetical

120. Only a few scholars have tried to analyze this text in comparison to midrashic patterns. Finkel, *Teacher of Nazareth*, pp. 155-58, is the only one we found to classify it as a *proem* homily; yet he makes no analysis other than the conjecture of the missing beatitudes noted above. Daube, *Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 170, thinks it has similarities to a rabbinic tripartite form of revolutionary action—protest—silencing of the remonstraters. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 96 n. 69, says that it appears to reflect an expository pattern that has been partly dissipated in transmission.

121. For a discussion of this pattern and examples from the rabbis, Philo and the NT, see the section in Chapter 2 on explicit midrash and the works there cited.

122. Like the rabbinic *proems* there is a double text here; yet the reading from the Pentateuch is not recorded because apparently someone other than Jesus was chosen to read it. Several scholars (e.g., Mann, *The Bible as Read*, pp. 283-87; and Finkel, *Teacher of Nazareth*, p. 155 n. 2) have suggested a Pentateuchal reading of Gen. 35.9 which would allow this passage to conform even more closely to the *proem* form of the rabbis.

123. Yet sometimes rabbinic *proem* midrashim also did not repeat the initial text (e.g., *Pes. R.* 17.3). See Ellis, 'Exegetical Patterns in 1 Corinthians and Romans', p. 215 n. 4; and my Chapter 2 nn. 74, 79.

124. See the similar conclusion on Mt. 21.33-46 (= Lk. 20.9-19) by Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 135.

patterns in the NT; they are likely attributable to such factors as an earlier stage in the development of the pattern, different theological emphases and an abbreviation of this tradition in its transmission.[125]

The presence of the *proem*-like midrash pattern is another evidence for the pre-resurrection origin of the passage. E.E. Ellis has shown (1) that the *proem* midrashim attributed to Jesus in the Gospels represent an exegetical pattern he used in his synagogue expositions (and likewise the *yelammedenu*, its sister form, reflects a form of Jesus' exegetical discussions with Jewish theologians), (2) that they have a *Sitz im Leben Jesu*, and (3) that they must be seen as a literary form (i.e., a form-critical classification) in which the teachings of the historical Jesus were transmitted from the beginning.[126] Thus, Ellis, while noting the abbreviations and alterations involved in the transmission process, states that Jesus' biblical 'expositions belong to the bedrock of the Gospel traditions and originate in the pre-resurrection mission of Jesus'.[127]

Conclusions

Several conclusions emerge from this analysis of Jesus' Nazareth sermon that pertain to (1) his exegetical method and (2) his biblical interpretation and that support (3) the narrative's programmatic nature, (4) its unity and (5) its historicity.

1. Jesus used several Jewish exegetical methods in his exposition of Isa. 61.1-2: the *gezerah shawah* (4.18; cf. 4.19, 24) that resulted in an

125. For a more detailed comparison between rabbinic and NT expository patterns, see esp. Ellis, 'Biblical Interpretation', pp. 706-709, who writes, 'the NT exegetical patterns... represent an earlier stage in the development of the art as well as a divergent theological orientation. In addition, they apparently have been frequently abbreviated and otherwise altered before their incorporation into the present NT context. Among the more notable differences, the NT midrashim (1) do not appear to be related to a (Pentateuchal) lectionary cycle, (2) often lack a second, proem text and (3) use a final text that does not correspond or allude to the initial text. Occasionally, (4) they have lost their catchword connections. More importantly, (5) they consistently have an eschatological orientation. Nevertheless, the NT patterns show an unmistakable resemblance to rabbinic midrash that cannot be coincidental and that permits a qualified label of "proem" and "*yelammedenu*".' Similarly, *idem*, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 159; and Borgen, *Bread*, pp. 51-58.

126. Ellis, 'New Directions', pp. 252-53; cf. *idem*, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 159.

127. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 97, n. 75; cf. 134.

implicit midrash (i.e., an interpretive rendering) of Isa. 61.1-2, a *pesher*-like formula and fulfillment motif in a heightened sense (4.21), and a *proem*-like midrash pattern. Although he used exegetical techniques and a commentary pattern that were commonly used in his day, he interpreted Isa. 61.1-2 in a distinctive manner by applying the text to himself.

2. Jesus' OT usage was prophetic and typological. The prophetic employment came in his claim to fulfill Isa. 61.1-2 (cf. 4.21 σήμερον πεπλήρωται). The typological application is evident in Jesus' claim to be the servant-messiah of Isaiah 61, his eschatological fulfillment of the OT Jubilee, and his depiction of his ministry by the prophets of Elijah and Elisha. Thus, in his citation and sermon on Isa. 61.1-2 and 58.6, Jesus combined the roles of the servant-messiah and the final eschatological prophet.

3. The passage, although not a Lukan composition, is programmatic for both Jesus' and the church's ministries, yet not merely on the basis of Lukan redaction but on the basis of Jesus' understanding of his mission and God's providence. While the quotation and sermon portray Jesus' ministry of eschatological deliverance (4.16-27), the subsequent rejection of the Jews foreshadowed both his crucifixion and the giving of the gospel to the Gentiles (4.28-30).

4. Two considerations based on the presence of midrashic elements in the passage strengthen the view that the pericope is a unity against those who find the text to be a composite of different traditions and redaction. (a) The catchword connections that are characteristic of the *proem* midrashim and that are present here (i.e., ἄφεσις in 4.18-19; δεκτός in 4.19, 24) suggest that the passage represents a unified exegetical discussion that has been highly summarized for incorporation into the Gospel. (b) Sanders's insight from 11QMelch shows that there is no break between vv. 22 and 23.[128]

5. The implicit and explicit midrashim that occur in this narrative provide further evidence for the historicity of the citation and sermon from the pre-resurrection Jesus. (a) The unique text form of the quotation is due to a midrashic alteration which resulted in a text form that is unparalleled in the Gospels or Judaism. This even meets

128. Although Sanders, 'From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4', pp. 92-95, does not deal with the *proem* pattern, he argues on other grounds that the midrashim found in the narrative shows its unity (see n. 117 above).

classical form criticism's most stringent criterion of dissimilarity.[129] (b) The *proem*-like pattern that appears in this passage is a literary form in which the biblical expositions of Jesus were transmitted from the beginning. Building on the studies of E.E. Ellis, we may take the presence of the *proem*, *yelammedenu* and similar exegetical patterns as evidence for the pre-resurrection origin and the unity of Jesus' biblical expositions considered below.

The Discussion with the Lawyer (10.25-37)

All three Synoptic Gospels contain varied discussions on the greatest OT commandment between Jesus and Jewish theologians (Mt. 22.34-40; Mk 12.28-34; Lk. 10.25-28). However, Lk. 10.25-28 has several distinctions from the debate in Matthew and Mark, and Luke's version alone preserves it joined to the parable of the Good Samaritan (10.29-37), which is unique to his Gospel. Concerning the relation of Luke's account to the supposed Synoptic parallels, three related critical issues need to be addressed: the source of 10.25-28, the unity of 10.25-28 with 10.29-37, and the historicity of the Lukan account.

At first glance, Lk. 10.25-28 might appear to be a duplication of Mt. 22.34-40/Mk 12.28-31 with certain redactional modifications since both accounts contain a conversation between Jesus and a lawyer in which the same two OT texts are cited (Deut. 6.5; Lev. 19.18; but Mk 12.29 adds Deut. 6.4), and since at 20.40 Luke omits the deliberation on the greatest commandment at the Jerusalem temple debates that Matthew and Mark record. Although Luke has the *one* agreement with the other two versions, several differences in Luke's account suggest that he records a different incident. The major differences are as follows. (1) In Matthew/Mark the question of the scribe is academic (on the greatest commandment); in Luke it is practical (on how to inherit eternal life). (2) In Matthew/Mark Jesus cites the OT; in Luke the lawyer does. (3) In Matthew/Mark Jesus' comment on the answer concerns the primacy of the commandments; in Luke Jesus says 'do this, and you will live'. (4) In Mark the scribe affirms Jesus' answer while in Luke Jesus appraises the lawyer's summary, and then

129. It is intriguing that this quotation, which classical form critics assign to a church creation, meets their main criterion for authenticity. For an explanation and critique of this criterion, see the section on the preresurrection origin of Jesus' OT usage in Chapter 1.

they proceed to discuss the meaning of a Jew's neighbor in Lev. 19.18. Furthermore, it seems that Luke did not record the Mt. 22.34-40/Mk 12.28-34 counterpart at 20.40, since he had already mentioned a similar episode at 10.25-28, but this does not mean that he regarded the two events as identical.[130]

Three views have been offered on Luke's source for the narrative. (1) Luke reworked Mark to use it as an introduction to the parable of the Good Samaritan.[131] (2) Luke either substituted a Q account (which Matthew used along with Mark in his version) or combined Mark and Q.[132] (3) Luke records a different event from his special source (L).[133] The latter view is the most persuasive because: (a) Luke's account is too different to relate the same episode as narrated by Matthew and Mark; (b) as T.W. Manson argued, 'great teachers constantly repeat themselves', and Jesus likely combined the two OT texts

130. So, e.g., Manson, *Sayings*, p. 259; Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 440-41; Geldenhuys, *Luke*, pp. 312-13 n. 1; and C.L. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1990), p. 230.

131. E.g., Perrin, *Rediscovering*, pp. 123-24; E. Linnemann, *Jesus of the Parables* (trans. J. Sturdy; New York: Harper & Row, 1966), pp. 56-58, 138-43; G. Bornkamm, 'Das Doppelgebot der Liebe', in W. Eltester (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1954), pp. 85-93, esp. 92; V.P. Furnish, *The Love Command in the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972), pp. 34-45; and Creed, *Luke*, pp. 150-52. Cf. Evans, *Saint Luke*, pp. 463-64, who favors Luke's reformulation of Mk 12.28-34 but allows for his using L.

132. Several scholars argue that Luke is using Q because of Luke and Matthew's verbal agreements against Mark (e.g., νομικός, [ἐκ]πειράζων αὐτόν, διδάσκαλε, ἐν τῷ νόμῳ) and their omission of Deut. 6.4. (1) Some find Luke using Q and Matthew combining Mark and Q: e.g., Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 22-23; A.J. Hultgren, 'The Double Commandment of Love in Mt 22.34-40', *CBQ* 36 (1974), pp. 373-78; and Ellis, 'New Directions', pp. 248-49 nn. 47-48. (2) Others see Luke using Q and Mark: e.g., G. Sellin, 'Lukas als Gleichniserzähler', *ZNW* 66 (1975), pp. 20-23; and Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, pp. 47-49. (3) A few think Luke used Mark, Q and Lk. 18.18-30: e.g., J. Lambrecht, *Once More Astonished* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), pp. 60-68.

133. E.g., Manson, *Sayings*, pp. 259-61; Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 440-41; and similarly, Plummer, *Luke*, pp. 283-84. Cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke X–XXIV* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), pp. 877-78, who ascribes the narrative to L but, unlike the scholars above, thinks the different forms of the debate over the greatest commandment are post-Easter variations of one incident (*contra* Manson and Marshall).

prior to the Mt. 22.34-40/Mk 12.28-34 incident. He proposed that since the lawyer's question was one widely discussed by the rabbis, the discussion of the chief commandments could arise frequently in Jesus' ministry, and that the lawyer repeated what he knew to be Jesus' opinion in order to question him further on the identity of a neighbor.[134]

Since the parable (10.29-37)[135] is found in Luke alone, it is debated whether it was joined to 10.25-28 by Luke (or the traditioners) or originally formed a unity with 10.25-28. Commentators, who generally adhere to classical form criticism, think the unity is secondary and therefore discount the historicity of the account. They argue that Jesus' question of 10.36 does not directly answer the lawyer's question of 10.29 and that 10.29, 36-37 come from Luke's hand to connect the parable to 10.25-28.[136]

134. Manson, *Sayings*, pp. 259-60. He is followed by such noted scholars as Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 440-41; J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (trans. S.H. Hooke; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, rev. edn, 1963), p. 202; and C.E.B. Cranfield, 'The Good Samaritan (Luke 10.25-37)', *TTod* 11 (1954), pp. 368-72. Otherwise: e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 878; Linnemann, *Parables*, pp. 141-43; Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 465; and Furnish, *Love Command*, p. 34.

135. For a discussion of the question of whether 10.29-36 is a parable, metaphor or exemplary story, see J.D. Crossan, 'Parable and Example in the Teaching of Jesus', *Semeia* 1 (1974), pp. 63-104 (= *idem*, *NTS* 18 [1972], pp. 285-307; and *idem*, *In Parables* [San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1973], pp. 53-78); D.O. Via, Jr, 'Parable and Example Story', *Semeia* 1 (1974), pp. 105-33; J.D. Crossan (ed.), 'The Good Samaritan'. *Semeia* 2 (1974), pp. 1-131; *idem*, 'The Good Samaritan: Towards a Generic Definition of Parable', *Semeia* 2 (1974), pp. 82-112; R.W. Funk, 'The Good Samaritan as Metaphor', *Semeia* 2 (1974), pp. 74-81; and *idem*, *Parables and Presence* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), pp. 29-34, pp. 55-66. Cf. B.B. Scott, *Hear then the Parable* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), pp. 191-92. Along with the debate they offer helpful surveys of the literature, but their opinions on the tradition history of the passage are questionable.

136. E.g., Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, p. 178; Perrin, *Rediscovering*, pp. 123-24; Creed, *Luke*, pp. 150-52; Furnish, *Love Command*, pp. 34-45; Lambrecht, *Once More*, pp. 65-68; Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 467; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, p. 121; and H. Binder, 'Das Gleichnis vom barmherzigen Samariter', *TZ* 15 (1959), pp. 176-94. Similarly, Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, pp. 191-92. Cf. Linnemann, *Parables*, pp. 56-58, 138-43, who sees the connection as secondary but does not find a discrepancy between 10.29, 36 or these verses to be redactional. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, pp. 882-83, asserts that all but 10.29, which Luke composed to join the two discussions, comes from Luke's L source. Sellin, 'Lukas als

The two main objections against the unity and historicity of the account have been ably answered. (1) Against the view that Jesus' answer of v. 36 does not fit the lawyer's question of v. 29, a number of scholars have shown that Jesus intentionally made this shift and changed the question to make a pointed lesson.[137] (2) Others have further demonstrated that, rather than displaying evidences of a redactional coupling, the passage forms a closely knit unity, especially based on its literary structure.[138] In arguing that the narrative is a unified exegetical debate, they show that the two parts of the narrative (vv. 25-28 and vv. 29-37) are closely paralleled in form[139] and that

Gleichniserzähler', pp. 29-32, argues that all of 10.29-37 is a Lukan composition.

137. E.g., P.L. Trudinger, 'Once Again, Now, "Who is my Neighbour?"', *EvQ* 48 (1976), pp. 160-63; N.L. Young, 'Once Again, Now, "Who is my Neighbour?"', *EvQ* 49 (1977), pp. 178-79; L. Ramaroson, 'Comme "le bon Samaritain", ne chercher qu'à aimer (Lc 10,29-37)', *Bib* 56 (1975), pp. 533-36; Marshall, *Luke*, p. 450; Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 205; Manson, *Sayings*, pp. 259-60; Schweizer, *Luke*, p. 187; Blomberg, *Parables*, p. 231; and Johnson, *Luke*, p. 173. Cf. J.C. Gordon, 'The Parable of the Good Samaritan (St Luke x.25-37)', *ExpTim* 56 (1945), pp. 302-4.

138. E.g., Marshall, *Luke*, p. 440, writes, 'The two sections in fact fit perfectly together, and it is difficult to imagine the parable without its present setting to provide a context for it'. See also pp. 444-46, for a reply to the major objections against its unity. Cf. Manson, *Sayings*, pp. 259-61; Jeremias, *Parables*, pp. 202; and Schweizer, *Luke*, p. 184. See also the works cited in nn. 139-40.

139. K.E. Bailey, *Through Peasant Eyes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), p. 34, defends the unity of the account on the basis of its structure and offers the following analysis:

> *Round one:* A lawyer stood up and put him to the test and said,
> (1) Lawyer: (Question 1) 'What must I *do* to inherit eternal *life*?'
> (2) Jesus: (Question 2) 'What about the law?'
> (3) Lawyer: (Answer to 2) 'Love God and your neighbor'.
> (4) Jesus: (Answer to 1) '*Do* this and *live*'.
> *Round Two:* He (the lawyer), desiring to *justify himself*, said,
> (5) Lawyer: (Question 3) 'Who is my neighbor?'
> (6) Jesus: (Question 4) 'A certain man went to Jerusalem...'. 'Which of these three became a neighbor?'
> (7) Lawyer: (Answer to 4) 'The one who showed mercy on him'.
> (8) Jesus: (Answer to 3) '*Go* and continue *doing* likewise'.

Bailey is built on by B. van Elderen, 'Another Look at the Parable of the Good Samaritan', in J.I. Cook (ed.), *Saved by Hope* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), pp. 109-19; and Blomberg, *Parables*, pp. 230-31. Otherwise: Crossan, 'Parable and Example', pp. 287-96, has a classical form-critical analysis of the structure and sees the two parts joined to form a controversy dialogue.

the account closely conforms to the rabbinic *yelammedenu* midrash pattern as I will demonstrate below in my literary analysis of the *yelammedenu* pattern.[140]

Since it has been shown that the Lk. 10.25-37 relates an incident separate from the episode of Mk 12.28-34 and that the account is a unity which does not require a traditio-critical dissection, we may treat with confidence Lk. 10.25-37 as a unified expository episode that originated in the earthly ministry of Jesus. The common-sense argument of Manson cited above still stands firm against recent allegations of Lukan redaction.

The Text Form of the Quotations

Like Mt. 22.37-39 and Mk 12.29-31, Lk. 10.27 contains quotations from Deut. 6.5 and Lev. 19.18, and it may be analyzed as follows:

> [26]ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν· ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις; [27]ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης [τῆς] καρδίας σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου, καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. (Lk. 10.26-27)

> καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεώς σου. (Deut. 6.5 LXX)

> ואהבת את יהוה אלהיך בכל־לבבך ובכל־נפשך ובכל־מאדך׃
> (Deut. 6.5 MT)

> καὶ οὐκ ἐκδικᾶταί σου ἡ χείρ, καὶ οὐ μηνιεῖς τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ σου καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος. (Lev. 19.18 LXX)

140. Only two scholars refer to the *yelammedenu* midrash to argue for the unity of 10.25-37: Ellis, 'New Directions', pp. 249-50, lists the following points: (1) the discussion on the commandments continues in the parable section (vv. 29-30, 36-37), (2) Lk. 10.29 does not appear to be a redactional coupling, (3) catchword connections suggest the whole passage was a unified exposition, and (4) Luke does not usually rework Jesus' parables into a midrashic pattern. Blomberg, *Parables*, pp. 230-31, follows Ellis. Others mention rabbinic expositions in which parables frequently appear as an evidence for the passage's unity: e.g., B. Gerhardsson, *The Good Samaritan—The Good Shepherd* (Lund: Gleerup, 1958), pp. 5-9, 22-31; Derrett, *Law*, pp. 208-27; and Ellis, *Luke*, p. 159. Cf. P.R. Jones, 'The Love Command in Parable', *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 6 (1979), pp. 224-26, who calls the passage a midrash, sees it as a unified exegetical debate with a *Sitz im Leben Jesu*, but does not mention the *yelammedenu* form.

לא־תקם ולא־תטר את־בני עמך ואהבת לרעך כמוך אני יהוה׃
(Lev. 19.18 MT)

Luke's quotation of Deut. 6.5 has several variations from the LXX and MT. (1) It adds a fourth prepositional phrase to the OT's three (καρδία/לבב, ψυχή/נפש, δύναμις/מאד): ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου. All three Synoptic Gospels vary from the OT and each other in the translation and in the order of the phrases;[141] most notably, they introduce διανοία.[142] (a) Luke and Mark add it to their list of καρδία, ψυχή, ἰσχύς; Matthew replaces ἰσχύς with διανοία. (b) Like Luke, Mk 12.30 has four phrases but in different order (= Luke's 1, 2, 4, 3); Mt. 22.37 has three (= Luke's 1, 2, 4). It is uncertain from where the fourth phrase originated although liturgical use is a likely supposition.[143] (2) The Lukan quotation substitutes ἰσχύς for the LXX

141. There is variation in the order and listing of the nouns in the Greek OT and the NT. For a tabular listing, see Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, p. 22; and Stendahl, *School*, pp. 73-74.

142. The secondary reading of the LXX^{B} has διανοία for the LXX^{A} καρδία which is likely an assimilation to the Gospels. See France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 240, 246; and Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 880.

143. On the liturgical nature of the Shema, see France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 240-41, who contends it is possible that the speaker combined two known variants (for constant liturgical use probably produced variants) and thus extended the list from three to four nouns in contrast to all known OT texts. He suggests that Qumran's practice of combining variants is a possible parallel. Similarly, Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 66-67. Stendahl, *School*, pp. 72-76, observes that καρδία and διανοία which are included in all the Synoptics are synonyms that translate לבב and claims it is improbable that the Evangelists knew any form of the Shema with such a repetition. He concludes, 'Nevertheless the wealth of variants indicates that there was no authorized Greek form of that part of the Jewish liturgy in the days of the evangelists or that there were different forms, which influenced the NT texts in different ways'; followed by Holtz, *Zitate bei Lukas*, pp. 66-67. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 443, who asserts that the inclusion of the fourth (διανοία) phrase seems to be an alternate to καρδία included by an oversight. K.J. Thomas, 'Liturgical Citations in the Synoptics', *NTS* 22 (1976), pp. 205-14, claims that the variations from the OT in Lk. 10.27 (and pars.) result from its use and application by the early church and that Jesus cited the OT in Hebrew without any significant interpretive variants. Cf. *idem*, 'Torah Citations in the Synoptics', *NTS* 24 (1977), pp. 85-96, where he denies Jesus used rabbinic methods in his interpretation of the Torah. In these essays Thomas builds on B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), by looking at legal texts that Lindars excluded.

δύναμις (cf. MT מאד) in the third prepositional phrase, which is also present in Mark but absent in Matthew.[144] (3) Luke's rendering substitutes ἐν for LXX ἐκ in the final three phrases.[145] In comparison, Mk 12.30 like the LXX has ἐκ in all its prepositional phrases; Mt. 22.36 has ἐν for all his phrases.

The Gospels' citation of Lev. 19.18b is quoted verbatim according to the LXX which faithfully renders the Hebrew text. Luke's version is joined to Deut. 6.5 on the basis of ἀγαπήσεις to form one commandment while the parallel in Mt. 22.39 and Mk 12.31 occurs as a separate quotation.[146]

An Exegesis of Luke 10.25-37

While the account opens without indicating the time or place of the incident, it proceeds to narrate an exegetical discussion between Jesus and a Jewish theologian. As such, it consists of two rounds of debate, each having two questions and two answers, and it revolves around the two questions asked by the lawyer: 'What must I do to inherit eternal life?' (vv. 25-28) and 'Who is my neighbor?' (vv. 29-37).

How to Inherit Eternal Life (vv. 25-28). The lawyer's (i.e., an expert in biblical law) standing up to question Jesus, addressing him as teacher, testing[147] him with an exegetical question, and the discussion's conformity to the *yelammedenu* pattern indicate that the setting was a Scripture discussion.[148] His question, 'What shall I do to inherit

144. LXX 4 Kgs 23.25 also has ἰσχύς in a similar formula. See Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, p. 23, who proposes that ἰσχύς had been accepted into the Greek version of the Shema.

145. Some Lukan manuscripts have ἐκ for all four phrases, probably in assimilation to the LXX. See Holtz, *Zitate bei Lukas*, pp. 64-65; Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 880; and Marshall, *Luke*, p. 443, for a discussion and a list of the MSS. Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, p. 24 n. 5, alleges Luke's combination of ἐν and ἐκ shows that he is working with more than one text tradition, which concerns a different incident.

146. Although Deut. 6.5 does not appear outside the Gospels, Lev. 19.18 is cited in Rom. 13.9; Gal. 5.14; Jas 2.8.

147. The force of ἐκπειράζων is debated: while some (e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 880; and Johnson, *Luke*, p. 172) see hostility in its use, others (e.g., Marshall, *Luke*, p. 442; and Manson, *Sayings*, p. 260) think it indicates a testing of Jesus' ability as a teacher.

148. Ellis, 'New Directions', p. 250 n. 53, shows that the form of 10.25-28 is

eternal life?', was a topic deliberated in rabbinic circles (e.g., *b. Ber.* 28b), as was the question on the greatest commandment in Scripture[149] (e.g., *b. Šab.* 31a; cf. Mt. 22.36; Mk 12.28),[150] and it is identical to the one asked by the rich ruler in Lk. 18.18.[151]

Jesus replies to the lawyer's question with a counter-question, ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις; that points the lawyer to the written Torah[152] and that asks him for his exegetical opinion. By posing this question, he makes the lawyer's interpretation of Scripture the object of testing rather than his own teaching.

The question πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις; was asked in the sense 'how do you expound the law at this point?'[153] It is similar to the formula

similar to what Daube (*Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 151-57) calls 'Socratic interrogation': hostile question (v. 25), counter question (v. 26), reply (v. 27), rejoinder (v. 28). This is a pattern of argument the rabbis (e.g., *b. Sanh.* 65b) likely adopted from Hellenistic rhetoric before the first century.

149. Ellis, *Luke*, p. 160, claims that inquiries about the greatest commandment and inheriting eternal life are the same in that they ask about how to attain the kingdom of God. For the concept of eternal life in the primary and secondary texts, see Marshall, *Luke*, p. 442; and Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, pp. 880, 1198-99.

150. For rabbinic references, see Str–B, I, p. 808 (on the question of inheriting eternal life), I, pp. 900-908 (on the question of the greatest commandment). Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 442; and Manson, *Teaching*, p. 303.

151. Due to the identical questions and similar discussions on eternal life and the law in 10.25-37 and 18.18-30, several scholars claim that the pericopes are in chiastic parallelism and that this parallelism is the key to the structure of Luke's central section. See M.D. Goulder, 'The Chiastic Structure of the Lucan Journey', *SE* 2 (1964), pp. 195-202, who was the first to propose this. He is built on by C.H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke–Acts* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974), pp. 51-56; K.E. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), pp. 79-85; *idem*, *Peasant Eyes*, p. 159; and van Elderen, 'Another Look', p. 110. Cf. H. Flender, *St Luke* (trans. R.H. Fuller and I. Fuller; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), p. 10. Otherwise: Blomberg, 'Luke's Central Section', pp. 233-48.

152. Grundmann, *Evangelium nach Lukas*, p. 222, stresses that Jesus asks for the written not the oral law. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 442.

153. Similarly, Plummer, *Luke*, p. 283; and Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 465. See Derrett, *Law*, p. 224; and Daube, *Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 433, for rabbinic examples (e.g., *'Abod. Zar.* 2.5). Otherwise: Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, I, p. 187; and Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 442-43, think the question means 'How do you recite?' in the sense that Jesus was forcing the lawyer to reply with the Shema that was regularly recited in worship.

'have you not read?' that was used by both the rabbis (e.g., *y. Ber.* 4d) and Jesus (e.g., Lk. 6.3) to imply that the hearer has read the Scripture but not understood its true meaning. In the NT it only appears on the lips of Jesus, and it usually occurs in Scripture debates with his religious opponents.[154]

Two of the most well-known verses in Scripture, Deut. 6.5 and Lev. 19.18,[155] were combined by the lawyer in answering Jesus.[156] The first commandment comes from the Shema (Deut. 6.4-9), Israel's creed that they recited twice daily (Deut. 6.7; cf. *Ber.* 1.1-4). It demands of Israel an absolute love for God, a love involving undivided loyalty and complete obedience, because of their father–son and covenant relationship.[157] In its Lukan rendering it employs four prepositional phrases to teach that individuals are to love God with their whole being.[158]

The second commandment comes from Israel's holiness code (Lev. 17–26) and demands that one love ones neighbor as oneself,[159]

154. See Daube, *Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 432-33; Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 79-80; *idem*, 'Quotations', p. 22; and *idem*, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 149. For further discussion and NT examples see Chapter 2, n. 19. For studies on Jesus and his Pharisaic opponents, see the works cited in Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 80 n. 9.

155. Plummer, *Luke*, p. 285, thinks that Deut. 6.5 is a natural answer to Jesus' question in consideration of the importance of the Shema but that the addition of Lev.19.18 is remarkable and may have been done to lead up to the question in 10.29.

156. On the practice of combined quotations in the rabbis and the NT, see Ellis, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 150; *idem*, 'Quotations', pp. 22-23; and *idem*, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 91.

157. For the concept of love in Deuteronomy, see W.L. Moran, 'The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy', *CBQ* 25 (1963), pp. 77-87; P.C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), pp. 169-70, and the literature there cited.

158. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 444, says, 'No clear distinctions can be made between the different aspects of human personality listed here. They were, however, differentiated in rabbinic theology.' Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 880, who defines each in their OT sense.

159. On the translation and meaning of ὡς [ἀγαπήσεις] σεαυτόν see J.D.M. Derrett, 'Love thy Neighbour as a Man Like thyself?', *ExpTim* 83 (1971), pp. 55-56, who suggests the translation 'as if he were yourself' against the NEB 'as a man like yourself'. In reply N.L. Young, 'The Commandment to Love your Neighbor as yourself and the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10.25-37)', *AUSS* 21 (1983), pp. 265-72, doubts that Jesus is exhorting a recognition of self-

that is, that Jews love their fellow-Israelites as themselves. In the OT the command to love other people was extended to the 'sojourners' (גרים) in the land (Lev. 19.34; cf. Deut. 10.19) but not to Samaritans or foreign Gentiles.[160] In Jesus' day an exclusive application of this verse remained the tendency; certain sects even interpreted it more strictly than suggested by its OT context. For example, the Pharisees often disdained the common Jew (Jn 7.49; cf. *Ab.* 2.6);[161] the Qumran sectarians were commanded 'to love all the sons of light [fellow community members]...and hate all the sons of darkness' (1QS 1.9-10; cf. 2.24; 5.25; 1QM 1.1); the Talmud taught that heretics, informers and renegades 'should be pushed (into the ditch) and not pulled out' (*b. 'Abod Zar.* 26a); and a widespread popular saying excluded enemies (Mt. 5.43).[162]

As mentioned above, the rabbis likewise sought to summarize the substance of the law in the most important commandment (e.g., *b. Šab.* 31a; *b. Mak.* 23b-24a).[163] Although these two citations in combination do not occur elsewhere in contemporary literature, their essence appears in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: T. Dan* 5.3, 'Throughout all your life love the Lord, and one another with a true heart'; *T. Iss.* 5.2, 'Love the Lord and your neighbor' (cf. *T. Iss.* 7.6; Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 2.63; *Did.* 1.2; *Barn.* 19.2, 5; Justin, *Dial.* 92.2-3; *Mart. Pol.* 3.3). Because the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*

worth and proposes 'as though you were loving yourself' due to the Greek syntax and due to the context of Lk. 10.30-35.

160. For studies on the exclusions in the OT and Jewish texts, see H. Greeven and J. Flichtner, 'πλησίον', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 311-18; Marshall, *Luke*, p. 444; and esp. Derrett, *Law*, p. 212, who cites *b. Sanh.* 57a which states that a Jew did not have to save a Samaritan's life. Otherwise: J. Bowman, 'The Parable of the Good Samaritan', *ExpTim* 59 (1947–48), pp. 151-53, 248-49, contends that the rabbis regarded the Samaritans as גרים (Lev. 19.34) and that by the parable Jesus was reminding the lawyer of Lev. 19.34.

161. For rabbinic examples, see Str–B, II, pp. 494-519.

162. This summary was largely drawn from Jeremias, *Parables*, pp. 202-203.

163. While *b. Šab.* 31a contains Hillel's summary of the Torah into the golden rule, *b. Mak.* 23b recounts a rabbinic discussion on the number of commandments that ranged from 1 to 613. See J.B. Stern, 'Jesus' Citation of Dt 6,5 and Lv 19,18 in the Light of Jewish Tradition', *CBQ* 28 (1965), pp. 312-16, who studies rabbinic parallels to Lk. 10.27 (and pars.) and concludes that the answer represents the best of the Jewish teaching of the day and that Jesus is here showing his familiarity and acceptance of normative Judaism.

passages cannot be assigned a pre-Christian date with certainty and may contain Christian interpolations, it is quite likely that Jesus originated the fusing of these OT commands and that the lawyer was quoting Jesus' words as suggested by Manson.[164]

In the Gospels the two OT texts were brought together by the *gezerah shawah* technique (i.e., the linking of two verses on the basis of a common catchword); they were connected by the common word ἀγαπήσεις/ואהבת.[165] In Lk. 10.27 the two commandments are united as one commandment without the repetition of ἀγαπήσεις that is found in both verses. But in Mt. 22.37-39 and Mk 12.30-31 they are listed separately and enumerated as the first and the second commandment.

Jesus confirms the lawyer's answer, but he also instructs him that he must obey the commandments to inherit eternal life, thus answering his initial question. Jesus' words τοῦτο ποίει καὶ ζήσῃ are an allusion to Lev. 18.5, which promises life to those who obey Yahweh's laws.[166]

Who is my Neighbor (vv. 29-37). The lawyer tries to justify[167] his initial question and regain the upperhand in the debate by referring to the disputed definition of a neighbor of Lev. 19.18. Like the question of v. 25, he asks another question, 'who is my neighbor?', that was extensively discussed in rabbinic circles (e.g., *'Abod Zar.* 1.1; 2.1-2; 4.9-10). By asking Jesus to clarify the limits of his neighbor, he implies that there can be a non-neighbor. In consideration of the disagreement among first-century Jews on the identity of a neighbor,

164. For a discussion of the origin of the combination of the commandments, see, e.g., Marshall, *Luke*, p. 444, who follows Manson (*Sayings*, pp. 259-63); and Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 879, who disagrees with Manson.

165. This has been noticed by W. Diezinger, 'Zum Liebesgebot Mk xii,28-34 und Parr', *NovT* 20 (1978), pp. 81-83; Gerhardsson, *Good Samaritan*, p. 6; and Finkel, *Teacher of Nazareth*, p. 174, who also provides a rabbinic example that employed the same catchword, ואהבת: *Sifra Qedošim* on Lev. 19.34 combined 19.34 with 19.18. See Chapter 2 above for a discussion of the *gezerah shawah* and the other exegetical rules attributed to Hillel.

166. The NA26 text and several scholars recognize the allusion to Lev. 18.5: e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 881; Ellis, *Luke*, p. 161; and Blomberg, *Parables*, p. 231.

167. See Marshall, *Luke*, p. 447. *Pace*, e.g., Geldenhuys, *Luke*, p. 311, who takes 'justification' in its technical Pauline sense.

the lawyer brought up a valid question for an exegetical debate.

Like the rabbis who frequently expounded difficult Scriptures through parables,[168] Jesus provides an intricate commentary on Lev. 19.18 by a simple parable (vv. 30-35). As Derrett attests, 'it is a highly scientific piece of instruction clothed in a deceptively popular style'.[169] Although Jesus told the parable to expound Lev. 19.18, he may have alluded to other OT texts about compassionate Samaritans (2 Chron. 28.8-15) and mercy (Hos. 6.6-9)[170] to provide some of its imagery as was typical of rabbinic parables.[171] The parable was likely fictional rather than a true story[172] despite its exceptionally lifelike and accurate details.[173] It describes the plight of a man[174] who, on a trip from Jerusalem to Jericho, was attacked by robbers,[175]

168. See Evans, *Noncanonical Writings*, pp. 227-31, for a list of parallels between the parables of Jesus and the rabbis.

169. Derrett, *Law*, p. 227.

170. Scholars have suggested that the parable is based on the following OT passages: (1) 2 Chron. 28.8-15: F.S. Spencer, '2 Chronicles 28.5-15 and the Parable of the Good Samaritan', *WTJ* 46 (1984), pp. 317-49; F.H. Wilkinson, 'Obed: Proto-Type of the Good Samaritan', *ExpTim* 69 (1957), p. 94; and J.M. Furness, 'Fresh Light on Luke 10.25-37', *ExpTim* 80 (1969), p. 182. (2) Hos. 6.6: Derrett, *Law*, pp. 208-27, argues that the raw materials of the parable were Hos. 6.6 (with the lesser influence of 1 Kgs 13.11-32; 2 Chron. 28.8-15) and that חסד (mercy) of Hos. 6.6 = אהבה (love) of Lev. 19.18. (3) Ezek. 34: Gerhardsson, *Good Samaritan*, pp. 9-31, contends that רעה (shepherd) was changed to רֵעֶה/רֵעַ (neighbor) through a wordplay. For a reply to Gerhardsson, see R.W. Funk, 'The Old Testament in Parable', *Encounter* 26 (1965), pp. 251-67 (= *idem*, *Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God* [New York: Harper & Row, 1966], pp. 149-222), who critiques his view as too speculative for acceptance. Similarly, Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 885.

171. C.H. Cave, 'The Parables and the Scriptures', *NTS* 11 (1965), p. 379, shows that, unlike NT parables, the substance of rabbinic parables was derived from the OT rather than the contemporary scene.

172. So, e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 883; Manson, *Sayings*, p. 262; and Blomberg, *Parables*, p. 232. Otherwise: Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 203; and Plummer, *Luke*, pp. 285-86. Cf. Geldenhuys, *Luke*, p. 319, who allows for this possibility.

173. See, e.g., E.F.F. Bishop, 'People on the Road to Jericho', *EvQ* 42 (1970), pp. 2-6; and *idem*, 'Down from Jerusalem to Jericho', *EvQ* 35 (1963), pp. 97-102. Cf. Josephus, *War* 4.8.3 §474.

174. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 447, states, 'The man is intentionally left undescribed; he can be any man, although a Jewish audience would naturally think of him as a Jew'.

175. Although the identity of the robbers, like the man, is not essential to the parable, λῃστής was sometimes used for Zealots. See C. Daniel, 'Les esséniens et

robbed, beaten, stripped and left half-dead.[176]

The priest and Levite, who saw the victim and then passed by on the *other* side of the road, likely were returning home to Jericho, a principal residence of the priests, after serving in the Jerusalem temple. It is uncertain whether they failed to render aid because of fear of being ambushed, religious callousness or prohibitions against defilement caused by contact with the dead (Lev. 21.1). The latter suggestion seems to be implied by their passing by on the other side of the road.[177] The reason is not stated because it is irrelevant; yet the point is made that religious leaders saw and passed by a needy person.

In stark contrast a Samaritan rendered aid and provided for the care of the wounded victim until he was well. Although the audience may have expected an Israelite layman to be the hero of the story and an anticlerical point to be made by the story,[178] a Samaritan is deliberately chosen by Jesus to shock his audience by comparing the failure of the Jewish clergy to the compassion of a hated Samaritan.[179] In

l'arrière-fond historique de la parabole du Bon Samaritain', *NovT* 11 (1969), pp. 71-104, who alleges (1) that the victim was an Essene (as Jericho contained an important Essene community) and that the robbers were Zealots, and (2) that the parable condemns the hatred between the rival sects. Similarly, K.H. Rengstorf, 'λῃστής', *TDNT*, IV, p. 261. Cf. Josephus, *War* 2.8.4 §125; 2.12.2 §228.

176. Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, p. 194, states, 'Robbers do not always strip their victims, but since the man is left naked beside the road, he now lacks identifying clothes and those passing on the road will be unable to tell what class, village, or nation he belongs'. Cf. Bailey, *Peasant Eyes*, p. 42.

177. So, e.g., Derrett, *Law*, pp. 211-17, who cites several rabbinic texts to support this view. Similarly, Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 887; and W.J. Masson, 'The Parable of the Good Samaritan', *ExpTim* 48 (1936–37), pp. 179-80. Otherwise: Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, pp. 196-97, argues that certain rabbinic texts required the priests and Levites to bury a neglected corpse (*Naz.* 7.1; *b. Naz.* 43b, 48b). Cf. J. Mann, 'Jesus and the Sadducean Priests', *JQR* 6 (1915), pp. 415-22, who maintains that the Pharisees demanded that a priest defile himself and bury a dead body on a road if no one was available to bury it, but the Sadducees, who rejected oral tradition, allowed him to pass to avoid defilement. Jeremias, *Parables*, pp. 203-204, rejects the defilement excuse for the Levite. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 448, is more tentative, 'The most that we can say is that there may be an attack on the ritualism which prevents acts of love'.

178. The expected triad is priest, Levite, Israelite. On this triadic formula in the Jewish literature, see Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, pp. 198-99, and the works cited.

179. A.J. Mattill, Jr, 'The Good Samaritan and the Purpose of Luke–Acts', *Encounter* 33 (1972), pp. 359-76, has revived the conjecture of J. Halévy ('Sens et

Jesus' day the Samaritans, who the Jews despised throughout their history (cf. *b. Sanh.* 57a), were hated more intensely than in earlier times because they recently had defiled (c. AD 6–9) the Jerusalem temple with human bones (Josephus, *Ant.* 18.2.2 §30; cf. Jn 4.9).[180]

Jesus' final question intentionally alters the lawyer's question of 10.29 and ends the parable with an unexpected, climactic twist. While the lawyer's question—who is my neighbor?—concerns the *object* of neighborliness, Jesus' question—who proved to be a neighbor?—deals with the *subject* of neighborliness. His question requires that the answer be given from the position of the wounded man; that is, it causes the lawyer to put himself in the place of the victim who is helped by the loathed Samaritan.[181]

The chief point of the parable is found in the lawyer's final answer and in the Samaritan's behavior: our neighbor is any needy person with whom we come in contact and can help, despite religious or ethnic barriers. Other subsidiary truths certainly are made by the parable. Besides the main teaching noted above, C.L. Blomberg finds a point in the actions of the other main characters. (1) The principle from the priest and the Levite is that religious status or legalistic casuistry do not excuse one from lovelessness. (2) The lesson from the victim is that even one's enemy is one's neighbor.[182]

Although many commentators have given the parable a christo-

origine de la parabole évangélique dite du bon Samaritain', *Revue des études juives* 4 [1882], pp. 249-55) that the parable originally referred to a good Israelite who Luke changed to a Samaritan. For a refutation of this view, see Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, p. 199 n. 50. Similarly, Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 887; and Marshall, *Luke*, p. 449, rightly reject this supposition as far-fetched.

180. Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 204; *idem*, 'Σαμάρεια κτλ.', *TDNT*, VII, pp. 88-94; *idem*, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (trans. F.H. Cave and C.H. Cave; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), pp. 352-58; and briefly, Marshall, *Luke*, p. 449.

181. See n. 137 above.

182. Blomberg, *Parables*, p. 233, advocates the common-sense exegetical principle that each of the main characters of a parable makes a main point (for his method see pp. 165-67) in contrast to the classic works of C.H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, rev. edn, 1961); and Jeremias, *Parables*, which find only one point per parable. Cf. the more extreme multi-point conclusions of Derrett, *Law*, pp. 221-22, who sees six; and Bailey, *Peasant Eyes*, pp. 55-56, who lists nine. For a discussion of the limited allegorical nature of Jesus' parables, see my discussion on Lk. 20.9-19 in Chapter 4 and the works there cited.

logical interpretation (i.e., the Samaritan = Jesus), this was certainly not Jesus' original intention; therefore, it must be rejected as invalid.[183] The parable clearly presents an ethical teaching of Jesus rather than a christological lesson.

A Yelammedenu-like Commentary Pattern

As stated above, a *yelammedenu*-like midrash pattern is the literary form found in the expository discussion of Lk. 10.25-37. The *yelammedenu* midrash has the same basic structure as its sister form, the *proem* midrash (e.g., Lk. 4.17-27), except for an interrogative opening, posing a question or problem, that the exposition will answer. In the NT the *yelammedenu* patterns attributed to Jesus usually involve discussions about the halakah (e.g., Lk. 6.1-5 pars.) or other theological questions (e.g., Lk. 20.27-40 pars.) between Jesus and other Jewish theologians.[184] Although 10.25-37 is certainly a compact summary of a more elaborate debate, the *yelammedenu*-like pattern is easily identifiable in form, and in the practices of linking texts and commentary by catchwords and illuminating Scripture with parables. It may be analyzed as follows.[185]

183. Most scholars from the Patristic period until the classic work of A. Jülicher (*Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* [2 vols.; Freiburg: Mohr, 1888–89]) held to a christological interpretation, and a few modern commentators have renewed this view: e.g., Gerhardsson, *Good Samaritan*; and B. Reicke, 'Der barmherzige Samariter', in O. Böcher and K. Haacker (eds.), *Verborum Veritas* (Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1970), pp. 103-109. Cf. Cranfield, 'Good Samaritan', pp. 371-72, who not only identifies the Samaritan as Jesus but also sees Jesus in the victim; and Binder, 'Das Gleichnis', pp. 184-94, who sees the wounded man as Jesus. Yet most authorities oppose the christological view: e.g., Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 205; Blomberg, *Parables*, p. 233; and Marshall, *Luke*, p. 447, on Binder. For a history of the interpretation of this parable, see W. Monselewski, *Der barmherzige Samariter* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1967).

184. For further discussion of this pattern and other NT and rabbinic examples, see the section on explicit midrash in Chapter 2 and the works there cited.

185. Only three scholars mention the *yelammedenu* pattern here: Ellis, 'New Directions', p. 250; *idem*, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 158; and *idem*, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 98 n. 76, 136 n. 31. Both Blomberg, *Parables*, p. 231; and Spencer, 'Parable of the Good Samaritan', p. 334, cite Ellis.

1. Verses 25-27: introductory question and initial texts (Deut. 6.5; Lev. 19.18), linked by ἀγαπήσεις
2. Verse 28: a second text (Lev. 18.5) in the form of an allusion
3. Verses 29-36: exposition by a parable and further dialogue, verbally linked to Lev. 19.18 by πλησίον (vv. 27, 29, 36) and to Lev. 18.5 by ποιεῖν (vv. 28, 37a, b)
4. Verse 37: final remarks and an allusion to Lev. 18.5

Conclusions

The following conclusions may be drawn from the Scripture debate in this narrative as to Jesus' (and the lawyer's) exegetical method and his biblical interpretation and their implications for the unity and pre-resurrection origin of the narrative.

1. In their exegetical discussion both Jesus and the lawyer used exegetical techniques common to the Judaism of their day. The lawyer combined Deut. 6.5 and Lev. 19.18 by the *gezerah shawah* technique. Jesus used a literal exegesis[186] within a *yelammedenu* commentary pattern in his exposition.

2. Jesus' commentary on Lev. 19.18 involved an ethical interpretation of what is meant by neighbor.[187] By expounding this verse with the parable of the Good Samaritan, he challenged the current Jewish understandings of this verse at an exegetical level and rejected their interpretation with a more inclusive view of the identity of a neighbor.[188]

186. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 66-67, in citing Mk 12.29-31 and pars., writes, Jesus often interpreted the OT in a 'literalist' manner, 'particularly in matters concerned with basic religious and moral values'.

187. Manson, *Teaching*, pp. 302-4, says the two OT commandments found in Lk. 10.27 and pars. are 'the ground-principles of the moral teaching of Jesus... For Jesus these two stand in a class by themselves. There is no other commandment that can come before them to claim man's obedience.' For discussions on the ethical teachings of Jesus, see, e.g., L.D. Hurst, 'Ethics of Jesus', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 210-22, and the works cited.

188. Ellis, 'Quotations', pp. 24-25, in noting the apologetic nature of many NT quotations that establish Jesus' continuity with the OT prophets according to Deut. 13.1-5, writes, 'The NT, therefore, never puts in opposition Jesus and the OT (not even in Mt. 5), but rather Jesus' interpretation of the OT and alternate interpretations. The hermeneutical question arises especially in the debates of Jesus and certain Jewish leaders (Mt. 19.3-9; Mk 12.10, 26, 35ff.; Lk. 10.25-37; 20.9-17; cf.

3. My analysis of the *yelammedenu* pattern present in this pericope bolster other studies that argue for the unity and the historicity of the narrative; thus, 10.25-28 was probably united to 10.29-37 from the beginning as a set piece of exposition originating in the earthly ministry of Jesus.

The Discussion with the Rich Ruler (18.18-30)

A version of the pericope of Jesus' dialogue with the rich ruler on how to inherit eternal life is found in each of the Synoptic Gospels (Mt. 19.16-30; Mk 10.17-31; Lk. 18.18-30).[189] Although they are quite similar and clearly recount the same incident, they leave us with a textual situation that cannot be adequately explained by either the theory of Markan or of Matthean priority.[190] They contain significant distinctions and significant points where each Gospel agrees with another against a third.

The authorities who have shown that the standard source theories fail to account for the points of agreement and distinction in the three versions propose a more complex system of dependence between the Gospels[191] or even suggest that they were independent productions.[192]

Jn. 5.46).' See also *idem*, 'New Directions', p. 253; and *idem*, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 138.

189. For a concise comparison and redactional analysis of Luke's version based on Markan priority, see Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, pp. 1196-97, 1203.

190. This is perhaps especially true of the theory of Markan priority and the accompanying argument that agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark are due to an independent editing of Mark (i.e., coincidence). For proponents of this view, see, e.g., Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, p. 142; Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 683-89; and Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, pp. 1196-206.

191. See, e.g., E.P. Sanders, 'Priorités et dépendances dans la tradition synoptique', *RSR* 60 (1972), pp. 519-40, which is based on his *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), in which he contested the standard source theories, argues the following for this and two similar passages: (1) Mark has secondary elements in each passage relative to Matthew and Luke and cannot be their source. (2) Luke has the least amount of redaction and preserves the oldest tradition. (3) In the passages at significant points each Gospel agrees with another against a third. (4) Luke cannot be seen as the most ancient *in toto*. Thus, (5) he rejects Markan priority and suggests that all three used an *Ur*-Gospel and have overlapping sources. Similarly, J. Weiss, '"Zum reichen Jüngling" Mk 10,13-27', *ZNW* 11 (1910), pp. 79-83; and Grundmann, *Evangelium nach*

These scholars provide a needed word of caution against automatically assigning elements in Matthew or Luke that are absent in Mark to the Evangelist's creation.

The Lk. 18.18-30 narrative easily divides into two parts: (1) Jesus' dialogue with a ruler on how to inherit eternal life (vv. 18-23) and (2) his subsequent discussion with his disciples on the relation of riches to the kingdom of God and discipleship (vv. 24-30).[193] The pericope appears to be a unity with the latter conversation growing out of the previous one.

Although as a triple-tradition incident its historicity is not questioned, some scholars reject the original unity of the account. A few commentators argue that Mk 10.17-31, and on the assumption of Markan priority, so also Mt. 19.16-30 and Lk. 18.18-30, is composed of three incidents that have been linked together by the Evangelist.[194] For example, C.E.B. Cranfield thinks that all three parts could have originally been independent and concludes that parts one and two (Mk 10.17-22, 23-27) probably belong together historically, that part three (10.28-31) may have been originally independent and attached by Mark due to a similarity of theme, and that 10.31, which is omitted here by Luke and which occurs elsewhere in the Gospels, is a floating *logion*.[195] More extreme is R. Bultmann who views the three-part Markan account as a series of isolated sayings (vv. 17b-22; 23a, 25a;

Lukas, p. 355 n. 3, think Matthew and Luke relied on an *Ur*-Gospel and preserve a more primitive text.

192. R.L. Thomas, 'The Rich Man in Matthew', *GTJ* 3 (1982), pp. 235-60, (1) demonstrates that there are ten agreements of omission and eighteen agreements of inclusion between Matthew and Luke against Mark, (2) argues that the Gospels were produced independently of one another, and (3) proposes that this approach allows the differing emphases of the Gospel writers to come from Jesus himself rather than the Evangelists. Thomas fails to allow for the possibility of Matthew and Luke's use of a Q tradition to explain their agreements against Mark.

193. Several scholars hold to this twofold structure. See, e.g., Ellis, *Luke*, p. 217; and Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 683-89.

194. The three Markan divisions (with the Lukan parallels) are as follows: Mk 10.17-22 (Lk. 18.18-22); Mk 10.23-27 (Lk. 18.23-27); Mk 10.28-31 (Lk. 18.28-30). Although this section primarily refers to the Markan version, the remainder of the discussion will be on Luke's account.

195. C.E.B. Cranfield, 'Riches and the Kingdom of God', *SJT* 4 (1951), pp. 302-13. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, pp. 1202-203; and Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 649.

29-30, 31) joined together by redactional links (vv. 17a; 23b, 24, 25b; 26-28).[196] But these scholars offer no substantial grounds for assuming that the units were originally independent.

Although it is possible that the Evangelists or the traditioners linked two or three events on a similar theme, the narrative appears to be a unified expository episode that originated in Jesus' pre-resurrection ministry.[197] That it probably was originally a unity is suggested by the flow of the conversation, which consists of later comments and questions growing out of prior ones, by the chiastic structure of the narrative, which begins and ends with the topic of inheriting eternal life,[198] and by the affinities of its literary form to two rabbinic patterns of exposition, which are discussed below.

196. Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 21-22, 54, 324. Similarly, E. Best, 'The Camel and the Needle's Eye (Mk 10.25)', *ExpTim* (1970), pp. 83-89; *idem*, *Following Jesus* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), pp. 110-19; S. Légasse, 'Jésus a-t-il annoncé la conversion finale d'Israël?', *NTS* 10 (1964), pp. 480-87; N. Walter, 'Zur Analyse von Mc 10.17-31', *ZNW* 53 (1962), pp. 206-18; and Perrin, *Rediscovering*, pp. 142-43. Cf. P.S. Minear, 'The Needle's Eye', *JBL* (1942), pp. 157-69, who has a more radical estimation of the redactional elements within the account. Although he admits that this type of analysis is 'inherently subjective and incapable of proof', he finds only vv. 21b, 25, 29-30a to be authentic and the rest to be later accretions used to bring the three isolated sayings into an account. For a summary of the representative views, see Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 686-87.

197. Several scholars treat this passage as a unity: e.g., Bailey, *Peasant Eyes*, pp. 157-70; Ellis, *Luke*, pp. 217-19; and Geldenhuys, *Luke*, pp. 457-62.

198. Bailey, *Peasant Eyes*, pp. 157-70, offers the following analysis of the chiastic structure of Lk. 18.18-30:

1 Inherit eternal life
2 Five old requirements with emphasis on family and property
3 The demands of the new obedience
4 The new obedience seen as too hard
5 The Parable of the camel and the needle
4' The new obedience seen as too hard but possible with God
3' The demands of the new obedience are fulfilled
2' Five new requirements with emphasis on property and family
1' Receive eternal life

Cf. *idem*, *Poet and Peasant*, pp. 52-53; and C. Coulot, 'La structuration de la péricope de l'homme riche et ses différentes lectures', *RevScRel* 56 (1982), pp. 240-52, and the works there cited.

The Text Form of Luke 18.20

A citation of the fifth through the ninth commandments from the second table of the decalogue (Exod. 20.12-16 = Deut. 5.16-20) appears in each of the Synoptic versions of Jesus' discussion with the rich ruler (Mt. 19.18-19; Mk 10.19; Lk. 18.20).[199] The Lukan quotation may be analyzed as follows:

> τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας· μὴ μοιχεύσῃς, μὴ φονεύσῃς, μὴ κλέψῃς, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα. (Lk. 18.20)

> [12]τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα, ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται, καὶ ἵνα μακροχρόνιος γένῃ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἀγαθῆς, ἧς κύριος ὁ θεός σου δίδωσίν σοι. [13]οὐ μοιχεύσεις. [14]οὐ κλέψεις. [15]οὐ φονεύσεις. [16]οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ. (Exod. 20.12-16 LXX)

> [16]τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου, ὃν τρόπον ἐνετείλατό σοι κύριος ὁ θεός σου, ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται, καὶ ἵνα μακροχρόνιος γένῃ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἧς κύριος ὁ θεός σου δίδωσίν σοι. [17]οὐ μοιχεύσεις. [18]οὐ φονεύσεις. [19]οὐ κλέψεις. [20]οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ. (Deut. 5.16-20 LXX)

> [12]כבד את־אביך ואת־אמך למען יארכן ימיך על
> האדמה אשר־יהוה אלהיך נתן לך: [13]לא תרצח: [14]לא תנאף: [15]לא תגנב:
> [16]לא־תענה ברעך עד שקר:
> (Exod. 20.12-16 MT)

> [16]כבד את־אביך ואת־אמך כאשר צוך יהוה אלהיך למען
> יאריכן ימיך ולמען ייטב לך על האדמה אשר־יהוה אלהיך נתן לך: [17]לא
> תרצח: [18]ולא תנאף: [19]ולא תגנב: [20]ולא־תענה ברעך עד שוא:
> (Deut. 5.16-20 MT)

Luke's quotation of the second half of the decalogue is of a mixed textual tradition; that is, it has some agreements and differences from the MT and the LXX. (1) Like the other Gospels, Luke has one difference from the MT and the LXX: it has the fifth commandment last against all OT versions.[200] All three Gospels have additional variations from each other and the OT in the order (see 3 below) and in the inclusion of the commandments. Mark adds μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς (cf.

199. Outside the Gospels portions of Exod. 20.12-16/Deut. 5.16-20 appear in Rom. 13.9; Eph. 6.2; Jas 2.11.

200. R.T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, p. 240, writes, 'It is hard to explain this otherwise than as fidelity to an original alteration of the order by Jesus through all the forms of textual tradition'.

Exod. 20.17; Deut. 24.14), and Matthew appends Lev. 19.18, against all OT texts. (2) Luke has one agreement with the MT against the LXX: like Mark, it has the commandment form of μή with the aorist subjunctive while Matthew follows the LXX οὐ with the future indicative (cf. Rom. 13.9). (3) Luke has one agreement with the LXX against the MT: in the ordering of the sixth through the ninth commandments, it follows the LXX^B at Deut. 5.16-20, reversing the sixth and seventh commandments (cf. Philo, *Dec.* 12.51; Nash papyrus; Rom. 13.9; Jas. 2.11); Matthew and Mark have the order of the MT and the LXX^A against the LXX^B.[201]

The order of the commandments in all the Synoptics and the additional decrees in Matthew and Mark remain a complicated textual problem. There is no apparent solution for the changes in the Gospels or the LXX^B, besides the suggestion that the commandments were used in catechetical instruction with considerable freedom.[202]

An Exegesis of Luke 18.18-30

Like many of the pericopes in Luke's central section, this one begins without specifying the time or place of the incident, and it appears as one of the many events on Jesus' journey to Jerusalem (cf. Mk 10.17). The account summarizes one of Jesus' exegetical discussions on the kingdom of God and has a two part structure. As such, it begins with a dialogue between Jesus and a rich ruler on how to inherit eternal life (vv. 18-23) and ends with a subsequent conversation between Jesus

201. The LXX^A is often suspected of assimilation to the NT, and some Markan MSS (A W θ f13 28 lat Cl ς) follow the order of the LXX^B like Luke. On these points, see, e.g., Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, p. 19; and Stendahl, *School*, p. 62.

202. Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, p. 17, declares, 'This quotation presents almost insoluble textual problems, doubtless because of its catechetical use'. Similarly, Stendahl, *School*, p. 62; Holtz, *Zitate bei Lukas*, pp. 81-82; and Marshall, *Luke*, p. 684. Otherwise: Bailey, *Peasant Eyes*, pp. 159-60, claims that the Lukan order of the commandments was deliberately altered by chiasmus to stress the subject of loyalty to family and attitudes toward property: a prohibition against adultery heads the list, a command to honor parents ends it, and 'do not steal' appears in the middle. Thomas, 'Liturgical Citations', concludes that these and similar changes in Jesus' OT quotations were done by the early church for interpretive and grammatical reasons. Cf. *idem*, 'Torah Citations'; and Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1199.

and his disciples on the relation of riches to the kingdom of God (vv. 24-30).

How to Inherit Eternal Life (vv. 18-23). A rich ruler begins by asking Jesus an exegetical question on how to inherit eternal life. That he is asking an exegetical question is suggested by the facts that it is the same question asked by the lawyer in an expository discussion in 10.25, that the rabbis deliberated this topic (e.g., *b. Ber.* 28b) as they also did the similar one on the greatest commandment (e.g., *b. Šab.* 31a; *b. Mak.* 23b-24a; cf. Mt. 22.36; Mk 12.28),[203] that this pericope has parallels in form to certain rabbinic patterns (see below), that he addresses Jesus as teacher,[204] and that he appears to be a religious ruler.[205]

First, Jesus rejects the description of himself as good; he appears to refrain from being called 'good' because this appellation belongs to God alone.[206] Thus, he is not saying anything about himself (as to his deity or sinfulness) but emphasizing the goodness of God and pointing the ruler to him.[207] However, Jesus' answer has proved to be a difficult christological problem to many commentators.[208]

203. See my treatment of 10.25 above for more detail on the deliberations on how to receive eternal life and on the identity of the greatest commandment.

204. In the rabbinica the address '*good* teacher' for a rabbi is rare, but it does appear in *b. Ta'an.* 24b. This is the only example cited by Str-B, II, p. 24. Otherwise: Plummer, *Luke*, p. 442; and Geldenhuys, *Luke*, p. 461 n. 2, claim that Jews and the Talmud did not use the title 'good teacher'.

205. See, e.g., Marshall, *Luke*, p. 684, who thinks that ἄρχων may mean a leader of a synagogue (cf. 8.41) or member of the Sanhedrin (23.13, 35; 24.20; cf. 14.1). Similarly, Stein, *Luke*, p. 456. Ellis, *Luke*, p. 217, calls him a 'religious ruler' and a 'churchman'. Cf. F. Hauck and W. Kasch, 'πλοῦτος κτλ.', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 328, who allege that in Luke 'the rich' refer to the Jewish opponents of Jesus. Otherwise: Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1198, *contra* Ellis, claims that it is uncertain whether he is a religious ruler, but admits that 'he appears as a representative of pious legal observance—possibly a synagogue leader, possibly not'.

206. Johnson, *Luke*, p. 276, suggests that the claim that God alone is good probably comes from Psalms which affirms God is good (ἀγαθός): 53.6; 72.1; 134.3; 135.1; cf. 117.1-4, 29.

207. Similarly, e.g., Marshall, *Luke*, p. 684; Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1199; Ellis, *Luke*, p. 216; and Plummer, *Luke*, p. 422. Cf. Cranfield, 'Riches', who thinks that Jesus is refuting an idea of goodness as characterized by the self-righteousness of the Pharisees, i.e., a legalistic works righteousness.

208. For a survey of the five major proposals that deal with the difficulty and

Then, Jesus answers the ruler's question by quoting commandments five through nine of the decalogue. He introduces them with the formula 'you know the commandments' (cf. 10.26), which is equivalent to an order to obey them.[209] It is uncertain why he only cites the second half of the decalogue, those concerned with relations to people, but does not also quote the first half, those concerned with relations to God; perhaps it is because these commandments could be outwardly judged.[210] Elsewhere he (Mt. 22.37-39 = Mk 12.29-31) and the lawyer of Lk. 10.25-37 whom he affirmed combined commandments to love God and neighbor.

Although the ruler's claim that he had obeyed all the commandments throughout his lifetime appears absurd at first glance, it is paralleled in the rabbis (e.g., *Ab.* 3.15; cf. Lk. 18.11)[211] and even in Paul (Phil. 3.6) and Lk. 1.6.

Despite his response of total obedience, Jesus gives him a further command to enable him to receive treasure in heaven (i.e., eternal

proponents of each, see Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1199. See also the following essays devoted to this problematic passage: W. Wagner, 'In welchem Sinne hat Jesus das Prädikat ΑΓΑΘΟΣ von sich abgewiesen?', *ZNW* 8 (1907), pp. 143-61; F. Spitta, 'Jesu Weigerung, sich als "gut" bezeichnen zu lassen', *ZNW* 9 (1908), pp. 12-20; and B.B. Warfield, 'Jesus' Alleged Confession of Sin', *Princeton Theological Review* 12 (1914), pp. 177-228. For a discussion of the variant form in Mt. 19.16-17 that avoids the christological difficulty, see esp. J.W. Wenham, 'Why Do you Ask me about the Good?', *NTS* 28 (1982), pp. 116-25, who finds Matthew's form to be secondary. Similarly, e.g., W. Grundmann, 'ἀγαθός κτλ.', *TDNT*, I, pp. 15-16. Otherwise: e.g., B. Blake, '"Good Master" (Mk x.17)', *ExpTim* 43 (1931–32), p. 334; and G. Murray, 'The Rich Young Man', *Downside Review* 103 (1985), pp. 144-46, argue that Matthew rather than Mark and Luke preserves the more primitive tradition.

209. Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 684-85; and Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1197.

210. Commentators offer various conjectures on why Jesus only cites the second half of the decalogue. E.g., Marshall, *Luke*, p. 685, thinks that it may be that Jesus was concerned with the ruler's love of his neighbor and did not mention love for God since no one could claim to keep that command fully, or that these were mentioned since obedience to them could be measured. Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 651, thinks that it is because of their relation to Jesus' additional command (18.22) of distributing the proceeds of the sale of his possessions to the poor.

211. The rabbis claimed that it was possible to keep the whole law and thought that several famous OT personages had done so: e.g., Abraham, Moses and Aaron. See Str–B, I, pp. 814-16; Marshall, *Luke*, p. 685; and Plummer, *Luke*, p. 423.

life).[212] Sell all you have and give the proceeds to the poor and follow me.[213] He gives this particular command because he recognized the ruler's true need and the commandment he had been breaking. The ruler was breaking the first commandment because he allowed his wealth to become an idol that he loved more than God (Exod. 20.3; Deut. 5.7). Therefore, he refuses to obey Jesus.[214] As C.H. Talbert states, 'Though he attempted to worship God and mammon at the same time, when the test was put to him he saw that his wealth was really his god... He did not really keep the first and greatest commandment so his lack of faith was exposed.'[215]

Riches and Discipleship (vv. 24-30). In response to the ruler's reaction, Jesus gives his disciples a lesson on how wealth can hinder people from entering the kingdom of God. He illustrates this problem by the hyperbolic comparison of a camel going though the eye of the needle, a comparison of Palestine's largest animal trying to get through its

212. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 685, equates treasure in heaven with eternal life. Otherwise: Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1200, objects that these are different. Cf. Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 652.

213. Although this passage has often been used as the basis for the monastic/religious idealization of poverty or a command for all disciples, scholars have shown that Jesus' command was specifically for this man in order to show him his need. For a discussion and critique of the major views, see esp. Seccombe, *Possessions*, pp. 118-30; and more briefly, Cranfield, 'Riches', pp. 309-10. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1198, and the essays he lists for the various views (pp. 1200-201). For a survey of the Synoptic passages on Jesus' view of property and riches, see M. Hengel, *Property and Riches in the Early Church* (trans. J. Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), pp. 23-30.

214. Because Luke (unlike Mt. 19.22; Mk 10.22) does not state that he left at this time, commentators disagree on the time of his departure. E.g., Marshall, *Luke*, p. 683; and Geldenhuys, *Luke*, p. 459, think that he leaves. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1200; and Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 652, argue that he is present, presumably through 18.27.

215. Talbert, *Reading Luke*, p. 172. Similarly, e.g., Cranfield, 'Riches', p. 309; Geldenhuys, *Luke*, p. 459; and Plummer, *Luke*, p. 423. Cf. Seccombe, *Possessions*, pp. 118-30, who lists the alternate views with representative proponents and alleges that Jesus' intent was that he did not want disciples with divided loyalties. Ellis, *Luke*, p. 218, thinks that Jesus refers to the one unmentioned commandment that the man failed to keep: do not covet. Stein, *Luke*, p. 457, says that Jesus shows the ruler that he did not really love God with his whole heart and his neighbor as himself.

smallest opening.[216] Jesus similarly contrasted a camel and a gnat, the largest and smallest creatures in Palestine, when rebuking the Pharisees in Mt. 23.24, and the rabbis used a parallel hyperbole of an elephant passing through a needle's eye to illustrate a teaching (*b. Ber.* 55b; *b. B. Meṣ.* 38b).[217]

Upon hearing this the disciples ask Jesus, 'Then who can be saved (i.e., enter the kingdom of God)?'[218] They implied that 'if the rich (whose wealth is generally seen as a sign of God's blessing) cannot enter the kingdom, how can anyone else enter it?'[219] Jesus responds to their bewilderment by telling them, 'What is impossible with men is possible with God';[220] that is, God can break a rich man free from his riches (or anyone free from what enslaves him) and save him.

Peter, as the disciples' spokesman, reminds Jesus that they had left their possessions (τὰ ἴδια) and followed him; in effect, they had done what the rich man refused to do. He seems to imply 'will we enter the kingdom?' or 'what will we receive in return?'[221] Jesus promises them that those who have left their homes and families for the sake of the kingdom will receive 'much more in this time[222] and eternal life in the

216. Some have sought to soften this hyperbole by suggesting (1) camel (κάμηλος) should be rope (κάμιλος) or (2) eye of the needle refers to the name of a small entrance in a city wall through which a camel might squeeze with difficulty. For representatives of these views, see Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1204. Several scholars have shown that both camel and eye of a needle should be understood literally. See, e.g., Fitzmeyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1204; O. Michel, 'κάμηλος', *TDNT*, III, pp. 592-94; Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 195; Marshall, *Luke*, p. 687; and Ellis, *Luke*, p. 218.

217. See Str–B, I, p. 828.

218. In this passage it seems that 'to inherit eternal life' (vv. 18, 30), 'have treasure in heaven' (v. 22), 'to enter the kingdom of God' (vv. 24-25, 29), and 'to be saved' (v. 26) are used synonymously. See, e.g., Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 683-89; Dodd, *Parables*, p. 28. Otherwise: e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1200, sees some differences. Cf. Evans, *Saint Luke*, pp. 652-53, who is uncertain.

219. See Marshall, *Luke*, p. 688; and Geldenhuys, *Luke*, p. 460.

220. Ellis, *Luke*, p. 218, thinks this is 'perhaps a hint that the young man later became a disciple'.

221. See Marshall, *Luke*, p. 688.

222. Geldenhuys, *Luke*, p. 460, stresses that the blessings in this life are not always or often material but spiritual. Talbert, *Reading Luke*, p. 173, finds that Luke unlike Mt. 19.29 and Mk 10.30 does not promise wealth but only community (i.e., the church family). Similarly, Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1206. Cf. Bailey, *Peasant Eyes*, p. 169, who sees an inverted parallelism between

age to come'.[223] Unlike Mt. 19.30 and Mk 10.31 Luke's account does not conclude with the saying about the first and the last (cf. 13.30) but ends with the promise of eternal life as it had begun with a question on how to inherit eternal life (18.18).

A Yelammedenu-like Commentary Pattern

Lk. 18.18-30 narrates an expository dialogue on entering the kingdom of God and on the rewards of discipleship within the kingdom. As such, it has affinities with the *yelammedenu* midrash pattern[224] in its use of a question and answer format, a Scripture citation, and a parabolic saying, but it lacks supplementary texts, catchword connections, and complete conformity to the pattern. As an abbreviated *yelammedenu*-like midrash it may be analyzed as follows: (1) a question and a biblical citation (Exod. 20.12-16; Deut. 5.16-20 in Lk. 18.18-20) and (2) further dialogue, including a parabolic saying (18.21-30).

However, the passage reflects more closely a rabbinic form of exegetical dialogue that D. Daube calls 'Public Retort and Private Explanation', (e.g., *Num. R.* on 19.2 = *Pes. K.* 40a; *Gen. R.* on 1.26 = *y. Ber.* 12). In the rabbis this pattern generally consisted of the following parts: hostile question by outsiders, retort, question by disciples, and explanation.[225] According to this format Lk. 18.18-30 may be analyzed as follows: (1) a question by a ruler on how to inherit eternal life (18.18), (2) a reply by Jesus on the sacrifice involved to

the commands of 18.20 and the sacrifices of 18.29.

223. On the biblical (and Jewish) conception of history and the manifestation of the kingdom of God within it as a two-stage framework (i.e., this age and the age to come), see Ellis, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', pp. 163-65; *idem*, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 101-105; *idem*, *Luke*, pp. 12-15, and the literature there cited.

224. See F. Manns, 'Une homilie yelammedenou: Marc 10, 17-31', in *Essais sur le Judéo-Christianisme* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1977), pp. 52-60, who classifies the literary form as a *yelammedenu* homily. Ellis, 'New Directions', p. 252 n. 63, refers to Mt. 19.16-26 [= Lk. 18.18-27] as a pattern similar to the *yelammedenu* of Lk. 10.25-37. For further detail on the *yelammedenu* see Chapter 2 and the analysis of Lk. 10.25-37 above.

225. Daube, *Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 141-50, does not deal with Lk. 18.18-30, but he argues for the unity and historicity of Mk 7.1-23 (= Mt. 15.1-20) on the basis of the presence of this pattern.

receive it (18.19-23),[226] (3) a comment by Jesus on how wealth can hinder the rich from entering the kingdom of God and a question by his disciples on who can be saved (18.24-26), and (4) an explanation on the possibility of salvation and the rewards of discipleship (18.27-30).[227]

Conclusions

From my analysis of Lk. 18.18-30 the following conclusions may be drawn on Jesus' exegetical method and his teachings on entering and being a disciple in the kingdom of God.

1. In his discussion with the rich ruler and with his disciples, Jesus quotes Scripture and answers their exegetical questions within a commentary pattern that is similar to the *yelammedenu* and that most closely follows the form called 'Public Retort and Private Explanation'. In this lesson Jesus first answers the ruler's question on inheriting eternal life publicly and then gives a teaching word to his disciples privately on the relation of riches to discipleship in the kingdom of God.

2. Jesus' citation and comment on the second table of the decalogue involves a doctrinal interpretation of Scripture on soteriology and discipleship within the kingdom of God. By this teaching he seems to correct the popular view of his day that one could receive eternal life through a legalistic-works righteousness, and he also implicitly shows the ruler that he was breaking the first commandment by allowing his wealth to become an idol that he loved more than God.

3. In his subsequent conversation with his disciples on the kingdom of God, Jesus teaches them that wealth can be a great hindrance to entering God's kingdom and that their sacrifices for the sake of the kingdom will be rewarded in this lifetime and in the age to come. In

226. As noted above, Matthew and Mark state that the ruler left at 18.23, but Luke does not specify when he left. If the ruler did not leave at 18.23, then this part seems to extend until 18.25.

227. The dialogue of Lk. 18.18-30 conforms nicely to this pattern except that there appears to be no hostility in the ruler's question. Certain minor differences may be expected due to such factors as the application of a rabbinic form to the Jesus situation or the NT context and abbreviations in the transmission of the Gospel traditions. Daube, *Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 141-50, (1) discusses two minor variations in form that occur both in the rabbis and in the NT (i.e., the subdividing of part 2 and the omission of parts 3 and 4) and (2) says the NT form may vary from the rabbis because the setting of Jesus' ministry differed from the rabbis.

the former teaching word he may be implicitly attacking the popular view that riches were always a sign of God's approval and blessing.

4. My analysis provides evidence that rather than a series of isolated sayings redactionally connected on the basis of thematic parallels, the narrative represents a two-part, unified expository episode (a public teaching by Jesus followed by a private explanation to his disciples) on the kingdom of God that originated in Jesus' earthly ministry.

Chapter 4

THE EXPOSITION OF OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS BY JESUS IN LUKE 20–24

Jesus' final four expository episodes in Luke's Gospel are analyzed in this chapter. These episodes occur in Jesus' ministry in the temple (19.45–21.38).[1] (1) The exposition of Isaiah 5 is a judgment on the temple authorities, 'the scribes and the chief priests', for rejecting Jesus (20.9-19). (2) The expositions on the resurrection (20.27-40) and (3) on the Christ as David's Lord (20.41-44) are two of Jesus' temple debates with the religious authorities. And (4) the saying on the coming of the Son of Man in the eschatological discourse (21.25-28) appears in a section that forecasts the temple's destruction.

The Exposition of Isaiah 5 (20.9-19)

Jesus' exposition of Isaiah 5, more commonly known as the parable of the Wicked Tenants, appears in all three Synoptic Gospels (Mt. 21.33-46; Mk 12.1-12; Lk. 20.9-19) and in *Gos. Thom.* 65-66.[2] Apart from Lk. 20.18 (= Mt. 21.44), Luke's version is more abbreviated than its Synoptic parallels, and Matthew's is the fullest of the three. Luke's parable shares several details with Matthew's that are absent in Mark (e.g., the expulsion of the son before his death [v. 15], the listeners' response to Jesus' question [v. 16], and the second stone saying [v. 18]), which suggests that they used a Q tradition in addition to the common triple tradition.[3]

1. For studies on the time frame and the organization of the temple incidents, see n. 22.

2. For a detailed comparison and tradition history of the accounts without a priority assumption, see K. Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), pp. 41-71. For a brief redactional analysis of Luke's version based on Markan priority, see Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, pp. 1277-78.

3. Because of the agreements between Matthew and Luke (assuming their

Because this parable is undeniably an allegory in its synoptic form and because it contains an OT quotation and several allusions to OT passages, scholars debate its original form and its authenticity.

A. Jülicher, in reaction to the arbitrary and elaborate allegorical interpretations of the patristic and medieval commentators, argued that Jesus' parables were simple comparisons that made one point and that did not require interpretation. By his a priori definition he claimed that Jesus' parables were not allegorical, and he attributed any allegorical traits to the Evangelists' creation. Because of the alleged psychological impossibilities in the actions of the characters and because of the allegorical features in the parable of the Wicked Tenants, he concluded that it was an allegory of the history of salvation which was created by the early church.[4]

In contrast several scholars, most notably C.H. Dodd and J. Jeremias, who were influenced by the presuppositions of Jülicher and of classical form criticism, thought that the pericope represents a genuine parable of Jesus that had undergone subsequent allegorization and expansion by the Gospel traditioners. In an attempt to find its original meaning, they stripped off the allegorical features and the OT elements, but they still ended up giving allegorical interpretations. Because of the abbreviated nature of *Gos. Thom.* 65-66, they held that it represents the most primitive form of the parable.[5]

mutual independence) against Mark, some scholars think that they used a Q tradition alone or in combination with Mark. For the use of Q alone, see, e.g., Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 56-71, who also argues that Matthew possesses the earliest version. For the use of Mark and Q, see, e.g., Ellis, 'New Directions', p. 251 n. 57. Cf. J.A.T. Robinson, 'The Parable of the Wicked Tenants', *NTS* 21 (1975), pp. 443-61, who alleges the use of Mark, Q and an *Ur*-Gospel; and a reply by J.B. Orchard, 'J.A.T. Robinson and the Synoptic Problem', *NTS* 22 (1976), pp. 346-52. Otherwise: e.g., Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, pp. 150-67, posits that Luke used Mark, and L. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, pp. 1277-78, argues for a combination of Mark and Lukan redaction. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 726-27.

4. Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, I, pp. 65-85; II, pp. 385-406. Similarly, e.g., Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 177, 205; and C.E. Carlston, *The Parables of the Triple Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), pp. 40-45, 76-81, 178-90. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1281, who calls it 'an allegorical presentation of Lucan salvation-history'.

5. Dodd, *Parables*, pp. 96-102; and Jeremias, *Parables*, pp. 70-77. Cf. van Iersel, *Der Sohn*, pp. 124-45, who attempts to reconstruct the original form by selecting the words and phrases from each of the versions that he considers original. Followed by X. Léon-Dufour, 'La parabole des vignerons homicides', *Sciences*

W.G. Kümmel classified the parable as an allegory and opposed Dodd and Jeremias's attempts to de-allegorize it, to separate the secondary elements, and to explain its improbabilities. Although he followed Jülicher's view of the parables, he did not think it should be rejected in its allegorical form on a priori grounds. However, he stressed alleged improbabilities in the actions of the characters, and he rejected its authenticity because of its alleged post-resurrection Christology.[6]

Recent studies have answered the above objections to the parable's original allegorical nature, to its use of a quotation and allusions from the OT, to its realism, and to its alleged post-Easter teachings.

First, numerous scholars have refuted the a priori rejection of the allegorical form of this and other Synoptic parables.[7] They argue the following. (1) The OT (e.g., 2 Sam. 12.1-4) and rabbinic parables (e.g., *b. Sanh.* 91a) were usually allegorical in nature,[8] and these parables rather than the Greek forms used by Jülicher provide a better

ecclésiastiques 17 (1965), pp. 365-96 (summarized in English in *idem*, 'The Murderous Vineyard Workers', *TD* 15 [1967], pp. 30-36). Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, pp. 237-53, offers a reconstruction similar to the Thomas version. Many like Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, pp. 173-74, assert that the OT elements were added for apologetic reasons. See also n. 17.

6. W.G. Kümmel, 'Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtnern (Mk 12,1-9)', in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne* (Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950). pp. 120-31; and *idem*, *Promise and Fulfilment* (trans. D.M. Barton; Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1957), pp. 82-83. Cf. Evans, *Saint Luke*, pp. 700-701.

7. E.g., M. Black, 'The Parables as Allegory', *BJRL* 18 (1960), pp. 273-87; J.M. Derrett, 'Allegory and the Wicked Vinedressers', *JTS* 25 (1974), pp. 426-32; John Drury, 'The Sower, the Vineyard, and the Place of Allegory in the Interpretation of Mark's Parables', *JTS* 24 (1973), pp. 367-79; R.E. Brown, 'Parable and Allegory Reconsidered', *NovT* 5 (1962), pp. 36-45; K.R. Snodgrass, 'Parable', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 591-600; *idem*, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 12-30; C.L. Blomberg, 'Interpreting the Parables of Jesus', *CBQ* 53 (1991), pp. 50-78; and *idem*, *Parables*, pp. 29-69, *passim*, who offers the most thorough and persuasive argument for the allegorical nature of all of the Synoptic parables and who presents a history of the debate on the possibility of Jesus using allegory.

8. They stress (1) that משל, which was almost always translated by παραβολή in the LXX, was used in the OT and by the rabbis for various types of figurative speech including allegory, and (2) that Jesus' use of parables should be understood against this Semitic background rather than Greek rhetoric. See also F. Hauck, 'παραβολή', *TDNT*, V, pp. 747-48.

background for interpreting Jesus' parables.[9] In fact, there are two rabbinic versions of this parable that are allegorical (*Sifre* Deut. 312; *Tanḥ.* B משלח 7).[10] (2) Modern literary critics have recognized the allegorical nature of Jesus' parables.[11] (3) Even those, such as Dodd and Jeremias, who deny the allegorical nature of Jesus' parables and de-allegorize them, are inconsistent in their approach because they often interpret them allegorically.[12]

Secondly, the parables of the rabbis often were laced with OT allusions and often ended with quotations in a manner similar to the parable of the Wicked Tenants.[13] Moreover, since this parable conforms to the rabbinic *proem* midrash pattern and has catchword connections which tie the OT citations to the parable, it probably reflects an exposition that was unified from the beginning.[14]

9. On the similarities between Jesus' and the rabbis' parables, see, e.g., D. Flusser, *Die rabbinischen Gleichnisse und der Gleichniserzähler Jesus* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1981), I; popularized recently in English by his student B.H. Young, *Jesus and his Jewish Parables* (New York: Paulist Press, 1989). For a summary and evaluation of this topic, noting similarities and differences between NT and rabbinic parables, see, e.g., Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 21-26; and Blomberg, *Parables*, pp. 58-69.

10. For a discussion of these texts in relation to Jesus' parable, see Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 25-26.

11. E.g., J.D. Crossan, 'Parable, Allegory, and Paradox', in D. Patte (ed.), *Semiology and Parables* (Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1976), pp. 247-81; and D.O. Via, Jr, *The Parables* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), pp. 2-25. See also the discussion and works cited by Blomberg, *Parables*, pp. 49-58; and Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 19-20.

12. E.g., Black, 'Parables as Allegory', p. 283, accused Dodd of trying to run with the allegorical hare and still hunt with the Jülicher hounds. Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 6-8, has similarly criticized Jeremias.

13. See, e.g., Derrett, 'Allegory', pp. 426-32, who (1) argues that *Sifre* Deut. 312 is related to the raw material that Jesus used for his parable and (2) concludes that *Sifre* Deut. 312 proves that a first-century Jewish scholar could tell an allegorical parable which was laced with OT allusions. Cf. Cave, 'Parables and the Scriptures', p. 379, who compares NT and rabbinic parables and finds that the substance of rabbinic parables was derived from the Scriptures.

14. E.E. Ellis, 'Midrashic Features in the Speeches in Acts', in *Prophecy and Hermeneutic* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1978), p. 206, states that although it is not impossible that the citations were added later to create a commentary framework, this practice is without parallel in the Synoptic tradition. Cf. *idem*, 'Midrash', p. 194; and *idem*, 'New Directions', p. 252. See my analysis of the *proem* pattern and its catchword connections below.

Thirdly, a number of authorities have shown that the parable describes a realistic situation in light of the known conditions of first-century Palestine and conclude that the parable likely originated in Jesus' pre-resurrection ministry. J.D.M. Derrett reconstructs the events of the parable in light of rabbinic law, and M. Hengel provides additional parallels from the Zenon papyri and from the rabbinic parables. Building on their essays, K. Snodgrass refutes in detail the eight charges of a lack of realism brought by some modern critics.[15]

Fourthly, Kümmel's objections to the parable's alleged early church theology have been countered: (1) If the early church created the idea of the Son's murder bringing the punishment on the Jews, it would have included the resurrection which was central to its theology rather than stopping at his death. (2) That the 'Son of God' was a pre-Christian Jewish messianic title is confirmed by parallels in the DSS (4QFlor 1.11; 1QSa 2.11-12).[16]

Furthermore, it is more likely that the abbreviated *Gospel of Thomas* version depended on the Synoptic tradition rather than that it represents the earliest form of the parable because of such factors as its late second- or third-century date, its Gnostic character, and the above discussion of the likelihood that Jesus would have used both allegory and OT references in his parables.[17]

15. Derrett, *Law*, pp. 286-312; M. Hengel, 'Das Gleichnis von den Weingärtnern Mc 12.1-12 im Lichte der Zenonpapyri und der rabbinischen Gleichnisse', *ZNW* 59 (1968), pp. 1-39; and Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 31-40. More briefly, e.g., E. Bammel, 'Das Gleichnis von bösen Winzern (Mk 12,1-9) und das jüdische Erbrecht', *Revue internationale des droites de l'antiquité* 3 (1959), pp. 11-17; Dodd, *Parables*, pp. 96-102; and Jeremias, *Parables*, pp. 74-76.

16. See, e.g., Ellis, *Luke*, p. 232; Stein, *Luke*, p. 491; and Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 84-86. Cf. F.C. Burkitt, 'The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen', in *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908), II, pp. 321-28, who was the first to argue against a church creation due to no mention of the resurrection.

17. Several scholars find the Thomas version to depend on the Synoptics, esp. on Luke: e.g., Ellis, 'Midrashic Features', p. 206; *idem*, 'New Directions', pp. 251-52; B. Dehandschutter, 'La parabole des vignerons homicides (Mc., XII,1-12) et l'évangile selon Thomas', in M. Sabbe (ed.), *L'évangile selon Marc* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988), pp. 203-20; W.R. Schoedel, 'Parables in the Gospel of Thomas', *CTM* 43 (1972), pp. 548-60; Snodgrass, 'The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen', *NTS* 20 (1974), pp. 142-44; *idem*, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 52-54; C.L. Blomberg, 'Tradition and Redaction in the Parables of the Gospel of Thomas', in D. Wenham (ed.), *Gospel Perspectives* (Sheffield: JSOT Press,

On the basis of these recent studies we may approach Lk. 20.9-19 as a unified allegorical parable that does not need to be stripped of its allegorical elements and OT references and that could have been spoken by Jesus with these features. As K.R. Snodgrass aptly states, 'if one rejects the dominical origin of this parable, he or she does so because of presuppositions about the nature of the Gospels...and not because of any element in the parable itself'.[18]

The Text Form of Luke 20.17

In this exposition there is one explicit quotation (Ps. 118.22) and several allusions to the OT (Isa. 5.1-2; 8.14-15; Dan. 2.34-35, 44-45). The citation may be analyzed as follows:

> ὁ δὲ ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς εἶπεν· τί οὖν ἐστιν τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦτο· λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας; (Lk. 20.17)

> λίθον, ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας· (Ps. 117.22 LXX)

> אבן מאסו הבונים היתה לראש פנה׃
> (Ps. 118.22 MT)

Lk. 20.17 and its parallels (Mt. 21.42/Mk 12.10-11) have an exact correspondence with the LXX Ps. 117.22,[19] which is an accurate

1984), V, pp. 177-206, and the works cited. On other texts, see, e.g., H. Schürmann, 'Das Thomasevangelium und das lukanische Sondergut', *BZ* 7 (1963), pp. 236-60; C. Tuckett, 'Thomas and the Synoptics', *NovT* 30 (1988), pp. 132-57, and the works cited. Otherwise: e.g., Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, pp. 165-67; Jeremias, *Parables*, pp. 70-77; Dodd, *Parables*, pp. 96-102; Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, pp. 1279-81; J.D. Crossan, 'The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen', *JBL* 90 (1971), pp. 451-65 (revised in *idem*, *In Parables*, pp. 79-120); A.B.J. Higgins, 'Non-Gnostic Sayings in the Gospel of Thomas', *NovT* 4 (1960), pp. 299-300; and H. Montefiore, 'A Comparison of the Gospel according to Thomas and of the Synoptic Gospels', *NTS* 7 (1961), pp. 236-38.

18. Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 107-108. For a persuasive defense of the authenticity of the parable on the lips of the earthly Jesus, see esp. *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 106-10, and the works there cited.

19. The LXX form of OT citations and allusions cannot be used as an argument for the secondary nature of a citation because the LXX form may be accounted for by (1) an assimilation to the LXX in the traditioning process, (2) a quotation of a Semitic original underlying the LXX, or (3) an original quotation in Greek. See further Chapter 3 nn. 18-19. *Pace*, e.g., Jeremias, *Parables*, pp. 70-77.

rendering of the MT Ps. 118.22. The Gospels agree with each other except that Luke stops at v. 22 while Matthew and Mark include v. 23. Matthew and Mark also agree against Luke in their similar IF.[20]

In the NT Ps. 118.22 also appears in Acts 4.11, where it is given a *pesher* rendering by Peter, and 1 Pet. 2.7, where it is cited in agreement with the LXX in a catena of texts on Christ the living stone (Isa. 28.16; 8.14; Ps. 118.22).[21]

An Exegesis of Luke 20.9-19

The exposition of Isaiah 5 is one of Jesus' teachings in the temple that have been grouped into a unit (19.45–21.38).[22] It is preceded by his cleansing of the temple and the reaction to it (19.45-48) and a challenge to his authority by the temple leaders (20.1-9), and it is followed by further debates with the religious authorities at the temple (20.20-47),[23] a lesson on temple offerings (21.1-4), and a prediction of the temple's destruction (21.5-38). This expository parable tells the story of the leasing of a vineyard to tenants (v. 9), who later reject the owner's servants (vv. 10-12) and his son (vv. 13-15a) and who are subsequently judged for their sinful actions (vv. 15b-18).

20. Mt. 21.42: οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς; Mk 12.10: οὐδὲ τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην ἀνέγνωτε; Lk. 20.17: τί οὖν ἐστιν τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦτο.

21. For an analysis of the text form of the NT appearances of Ps. 118.22-23, see Holtz, *Zitate bei Lukas*, pp. 160-63, who looks at Luke–Acts; and Stendahl, *School*, pp. 67-69, who deals with the Gospels and 1 Pet. 2.6-8. Cf. Ellis, 'Midrashic Features', pp. 205-208, who discusses the midrashic features of Acts 4.11 and argues that this testimony had its origin in a Christian midrash although not in the midrash of Lk. 20.9-18.

22. On the time frame and the grouping of these episodes, see, e.g., T.W. Manson, 'The Cleansing of the Temple', *BJRL* 33 (1950–51), pp. 271-82, who argues that Jesus' last days in Jerusalem have been 'telescoped' and that the period beginning with the cleansing of the temple lasted about six months. D. Daube, 'The Earliest Structure of the Gospels', *NTS* 5 (1959), pp. 174-89; and *idem*, *Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 158-69, alleges that the structure of the temple debates is based upon a rabbinic pattern used in the Passover-eve discussions. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 723. Ellis, *Luke*, p. 228, thinks that it is probable that Jesus' Scripture discussions in the temple debates formed a thematic collection before they were incorporated into the Gospels. Cf. Talbert, *Reading Luke*, p. 188.

23. Luke omits the question about the chief commandment at 20.40 recorded in Mk 12.28-34 and Mt. 22.34-40, probably because of the similar discussion he reported in 10.25-28. For more detail see the discussion on 10.25-37 in Chapter 3 above.

The Leasing of the Vineyard (v. 9). Because the religious leaders[24] had rejected Jesus' person and teachings (cf. 20.1-8), he speaks a parable in judgment of them through an exposition of Isa. 5.1-7,[25] which was a juridical and allegorical parable in its OT context.[26] Although he alters his version somewhat from the Isaianic parable by changing the roles of the parabolic figures, he uses it for a similar juridical function (cf. 20.15b-18).

In the Isaianic parable the prophet compares the unrighteous nation to a vineyard that Yahweh planted and nurtured but that yielded bad grapes rather than good ones. Because Yahweh looked for justice and righteousness but found murder and oppression instead, the prophet warns of Yahweh's judgment of destruction. Jesus uses Isa. 5.1-2 as the foundation to construct his parable.[27] But he shifts the focus of the parable in Isaiah 5 from God's vineyard[28] and its bad fruit, allegor-

24. While in Mk 12.1 αὐτοῖς refers to the authorities of the preceding episode in which Jesus' authority is questioned, Lk. 20.9 says it was spoken to the people, but the leaders are implicitly present (20.19). Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, p. 45, cautions that one should not overstress the proximity of the parable with the authority question since Matthew places an additional parable between them; yet he thinks the Evangelists intended it to serve as a veiled answer to the question.

25. On Jesus' exposition of Scripture in debate with his opposition, see Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 116-18.

26. Several recent studies classify Isa. 5.1-7 as a juridical parable. See, e.g., J.T. Willis, 'The Genre of Isaiah 5.1-7', *JBL* (1977), pp. 337-62; G.A. Yee, 'The Form-Critical Study of Isaiah 5.1-7 as a Song and a Juridical Parable', *CBQ* 43 (1981), pp. 30-40; G.T. Sheppard, 'More on Isaiah 5.1-7 as a Juridical Parable', *CBQ* 44 (1982), pp. 45-47; and C.A. Evans, 'On the Vineyard Parables of Isaiah 5 and Mark 12', *BZ* 28 (1984), pp. 82-86. In analyzing the exegetical history of the vineyard parable Evans argues (1) that, after the Babylonian exile and during the emergence of the targumic traditions, Isa. 5.1-7 came to be understood as a prediction of the temple's destruction, and (2) that this explains the presence of the rejected stone saying in Mk 12.10-11 which anticipates the erection of a new temple. He thinks that the second stone saying of Lk. 20.18 probably comes from the early church stone *testimonia.*

27. Although the allusion to Isa. 5.1-2 is fuller in Mt. 21.33 and Mk 12.1 than in Lk. 20.9 (which omits the fence, winepress and tower), it is still apparent in Lk. 20.9. See, e.g., Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 47-48, who notes Luke's habit of abbreviating inessential details. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 728; and Johnson, *Luke*, pp. 305-306, who lists several parallels. Otherwise: e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1281; Jeremias, *Parables*, pp. 70-71; Leaney, *Luke*, p. 250; and Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, p. 243, see no Isa. 5 allusion in Luke.

28. Several OT texts represent the people of Israel as God's vineyard: e.g.,

ically identified as unrighteous Israel and their sin, to the vineyard's tenant farmers and their evil actions, allegorically identified as Israel's unrighteous religious authorities and their rejection of God's emissaries.[29]

Like Isa. 5.1-7, Jesus identifies the vineyard with Israel, the people of God,[30] and the vineyard owner with God. Besides the tenants who represent Israel's leaders (vv. 9b-16; cf. v. 19), he adds to the foundational Isaianic parable the figures of the servants who represent the prophets (vv. 10-12) and of the son who represents himself (vv. 13-15a).

The Rejection of the Servants (vv. 10-12). The three servants, who were sent by the owner to collect the produce but who instead were beaten and abused by the tenants,[31] were probably understood by the original hearers to represent the prophets of old[32] since the OT

Deut. 32.32-33; Ps. 80.8-13; Isa. 5.1-7; 27.2-6; Jer. 2.21; Ezek. 15.1-6; 19.10-14; Hos. 10.1; Joel 1.7. For the rabbinic literature, see Str–B, II, pp. 563-64. Cf. Jn 15.1-5 in allusion to Jer. 2.21 which speaks of Jesus as God's vine.

29. In error some argue that Jesus transferred the traditional meaning of the vineyard as Israel to the tenants; thus, they identify the tenants as Israel rather than its leaders and see a picture of salvation history (i.e., the Gentiles or the church replacing Israel). See, e.g., J. Blank, 'Die Sendung des Sohnes', in J. Gnilka (ed.), *Neues Testament und Kirche* (Freiburg: Herder, 1974), p. 14; and Bock, *Proclamation*, p. 126. Cf. Plummer, *Luke*, p. 458. Yet others have demonstrated that Jesus does not transfer the traditional meaning of the vineyard to the tenants but intends the tenants to represent Israel's religious leaders. See, e.g., the following who specifically oppose this view: Blomberg, *Parables*, p. 248 n. 100; Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, p. 77; and A. Cornette, 'Notes sur la parabole des vignerons', *Foi et Vie* 84 (1985), pp. 42-48. See also n. 41.

30. Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 74-76, claims that the vineyard in Isa. 5 and in Jesus' parable is not the nation Israel but the elect people of God and the privileges of this election. Cf. Mt. 21.43 which equates the vineyard with the kingdom of God.

31. The three Synoptics vary in the details surrounding the servants. In distinction to Luke (1) Matthew has two groups that are sent with the second and third servant killed in the first group, and Mark has the third killed. (2) Matthew and Mark have additional servants sent after the initial three.

32. *Pace*, e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1281, who claims that it is uncertain what group if any the servants represent; and Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 71, who finds no allegorical meaning in them. But see, e.g., Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, p. 78.

frequently referred to the prophets as servants of God.[33] Although the OT often called the prophets God's servants, none of the servants mentioned can be identified with a specific prophet.

In Jesus' parable the servants (= prophets) are persecuted and killed (in Matthew and Mark) while in the OT the fate of specific prophets is rarely mentioned. In the OT only two named prophets are reported as murdered (Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada [2 Chron. 24.21] and Uriah [Jer. 26.20]), but unnamed prophets are recorded as killed (1 Kgs 18.13; 19.10, 14; Neh. 9.26; Jer. 2.30) and some as persecuted (1 Kgs 22.27; 2 Chron. 16.10; 36.16; Jer. 37.15). In the Apocrypha five prophets (Amos, Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel) are said to have been martyred, and in the NT the killing of the prophets is a common theme (Mt. 23.31; Acts 7.52; 1 Thess. 2.15; Heb. 11.36-38; cf. *Jub.* 1.12-13).

The Rejection of the Son (vv. 13-15a). After the rejection of the three servants, the owner's only son is killed by the tenants[34] in the climax of the story.[35] Although Jesus allegorically represents the son as himself, God's Son,[36] he does so in a veiled manner, which was character-

33. 1 Kgs 14.18; 15.29; 2 Kgs 9.7, 36; 10.10; 14.24; 17.13, 23; 21.10; 24.2; Ezra 9.11; Isa. 20.3; 44.26; 50.10; Jer. 7.25; 25.4; 26.5; 29.19; 35.15; 44.4; Ezek. 38.17; Dan. 9.6, 10; Amos 3.7; Zech. 1.6.

34. While in Mark he is killed then thrown out, in Matthew and Luke he is thrown out then killed. Most scholars (e.g., Ellis, *Luke*, p. 232; Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1285; and Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 73) think that Matthew and Luke changed the order to accommodate the events of Jesus' death outside of Jerusalem, but others (e.g., Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 60-61; and Marshall, *Luke*, p. 731) argue that this is unconvincing, especially since the vineyard does not stand for Jerusalem.

35. Luke uses a three plus one formula (prophets + Jesus), a commonly used literary device in which the fourth part formed a dramatic climax. See, e.g., Ellis, *Luke*, p. 232.

36. *Pace*, e.g., A. Milavec, 'The Identity of "the Son" and "the Others"', *BTB* 20 (1990), pp. 30-37; and *idem*, 'Mark's Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen as Reaffirming God's Predilection for Israel', *JES* 26 (1989), pp. 289-312, who thinks the son does not represent Jesus but is only part of the machinery of the story. A. Gray, 'The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen', *HibJ* (1920–21), pp. 42-52; and M. Lowe, 'From the Parable of the Vineyard to a Pre-Synoptic Source', *NTS* 28 (1982), pp. 257-63, contend that the killing of the son in the parable refers to the death of John the Baptist. Cf. J.C. O'Neill, 'The Source of the Parables of the Bridegroom and the Wicked Husbandmen', *JTS* 39 (1988), pp. 485-89, who claims

istic of his public presentations of his messiahship and which may not have been immediately perceived by his hearers.[37] As E.E. Ellis states, 'While Jesus veils the reference to himself, for the perceptive hearer he makes via the parable both a messianic claim and a prediction of his violent death'.[38]

The Judgment of the Tenants (vv. 15b-18). In ending the parable, Jesus asks a rhetorical question (v. 15b), gives a judgment pronouncement (v. 16), and illustrates his rejection and the leaders' judgment through a series of OT 'stone' texts (vv. 17-18).

That the religious authorities are represented by the tenants is obvious when the parable is read with a knowledge of Jesus' conflicts with them and with the explanation of 20.19. Yet the Jewish leaders would not have realized this at the time of Jesus' rhetorical question about what the owner should do to the tenants (v. 15b). They would have passed judgment at this time (cf. Mt. 21.41) without knowing that they had condemned themselves since the parable draws them in and requires that a judgment be made by its description of the persecution and killing of God's servants. At first they may have thought that the tenants referred to a foreign power who occupied Israel, such as the Romans, and they would have been utterly shocked when they discovered at the end of the parable that it was spoken against them (vv. 17-19).[39]

In the judgment pronouncement (v. 16) Jesus predicts that his Father will destroy the Jewish authorities, who have been entrusted with the spiritual leadership of God's people, and replace them with others. Yet again he makes the references to himself, to the leaders

that John the Baptist spoke this parable about Jesus. For a reply to Gray and Lowe, see Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 81-82; and Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1278.

37. In the rabbinic forms of this parable (*Sifre* Deut. 312; *Tanḥ.* B בשלח 7) the son is Jacob and the nation is Israel; thus, in the rabbinic parable the son has no messianic connotations. But the son of God was used of the messiah in pre-Christian Judaism at Qumran (4QFlor 1.11; 1QSa 2.11-12). Cf. Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, p. 75, who thinks that the hearers saw Jesus as the Son.

38. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 135; cf. *idem*, *Luke*, pp. 232-33.

39. See Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 77-78. Otherwise: J.E. Newell and R.R. Newell, 'The Parable of the Wicked Tenants', *NovT* 14 (1972), pp. 226-37, propose that Jesus told the parable against the Zealots.

and to the time of their judgment in a veiled manner.

Because of the imprecise nature of the details, the transfer of the vineyard and the time of the judgment are disputed issues of interpretation. First, the transfer of the vineyard is a transfer of the care of God's people from the Jewish leaders to Jesus and his apostles, not a transfer of God's election from Israel to the church.[40] The parable is a judgment of the leaders not Israel as a whole, and it indicates that the vineyard is taken from the *leaders* not the nation. Thus, it foretells a transfer in the leadership of God's people not a transfer in the identity of God's people. If one assumes a rejection of Israel as a whole, the parable has to be seen as inconsistent in its allegorical figures (i.e., the tenants sometimes represent the leaders and sometimes Israel, or Israel is sometimes represented by the vineyard and sometimes by the tenants). This is impossible since the vineyard rather than the tenants stands for God's people (Israel) and since the leaders rather than the people knew the parable was spoken against them.[41] Secondly, because of the eschatological tone of the narrative and of the OT citations in 20.17-18, the time of the judgment seems to refer to the parousia but possibly to the destruction of Jerusalem or to both.[42]

40. E.g., Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 135, states that Jesus will replace the tenants. Talbert, *Reading Luke*, p. 189; and Schweizer, *Luke*, p. 304, think that the apostles are in mind. Similarly, Geldenhuys, *Luke*, p. 498, says that they are the apostles and the church's later spiritual leaders.

41. Similarly, Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 90-95; and Blomberg, *Parables*, pp. 248-49. Cf. Young, *Jewish Parables*, pp. 282-317, who posits that it was spoken against the temple authorities because they received their positions and support through collaboration with Rome. Otherwise: e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1281, sees 'the others' as believers in general. Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 698, is unsure if the new tenants are the church or her leaders. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 731, thinks that the early church may have seen a reference to the Gentiles entering the church (cf. Mt. 21.43). See also n. 29 above. Similarly, Stein, *Luke*, p. 490, says that Luke's readers would see the 'others' as Gentiles.

42. Most favor the parousia: e.g., Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 95; and J. Jeremias, 'λίθος', *TDNT*, IV, pp. 274-76, who defended the authenticity of the OT citations in this article although he later rejected them in *Parables*. A few scholars opt for Jerusalem's destruction: e.g., Caird, *Luke*, p. 221; Geldenhuys, *Luke*, p. 499; and Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 698. Otherwise: Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, p. 90, says, 'Any attempt to see an allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem or the parousia in any of the accounts is impossible'. He also has a helpful discussion on these two difficult issues (pp. 87-95).

In finishing his exposition of Isaiah 5,[43] Jesus speaks of himself as a rejected (v. 17) but judging stone (v. 18)[44] by joining together the rejected stone of Ps. 118.22, the stumbling stone of Isa. 8.14-15, and the crushing stone of Dan. 2.34-35, 44-45,[45] all of which were given an eschatological and messianic interpretation in Judaism.[46] He uses several Jewish exegetical techniques in his citation of these texts. He ties the three 'stone' texts together by *gezerah shawah* based on the common catchword λίθος/אבן (stone)[47] and links them to the original

43. Although the imagery changes from the vineyard to the building here, this transition was present in Isa. 5.7 and occurred elsewhere (e.g., 1QS 8.5; 1 Cor. 3.9).

44. Whether the cornerstone is a foundation stone or a capstone is debated by scholars. For the capstone, see esp. Jeremias, 'λίθος', pp. 274-76 (stresses keystone); and J.M. Derrett, 'The Stone the Builders Rejected', *SE* 4 (1968), pp. 180-86. For the foundation stone, see esp. Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 102-103; and R.J. McKelvey, *The New Temple* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), pp. 195-204. Yet the position of the stone does not seem to be significant for interpretation, and the images of the stones in Lk. 20.17-18 appear to be mixed.

45. Although it seems clear that Lk. 20.18 is composed of a fusion of allusions to Isa. 8.14-15 and Dan. 2.34-35, 44-45 as cited in the NA26 margin, scholars disagree on which texts if any are employed. E.g., Marshall, *Luke*, p. 732; Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1286; France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 98-99; Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, p. 68; and Stein, *Luke*, p. 493, cite both texts. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 135; and Blomberg, *Parables*, p. 251, only find the Dan. 2 allusions. Johnson, *Luke*, p. 309, only sees the Isa. 8.14 allusion. Others (e.g., Bock, *Proclamation*, p. 127; Manson, *Sayings*, p. 322; cf. G. Bornkamm, 'λικμάω', *TDNT*, IV, pp. 280-81 n. 10) question the presence of any OT allusions and suggest that the proverb has a parallel in Midrash on Est. 3.6: 'Should the stone fall on the crock, woe to the crock. Should the crock fall on the stone, woe to the crock. In either case woe to the crock'.

46. On Ps. 118.22; Isa. 8.14-15; Dan. 2.34-35 see respectively, e.g., *Targ. Ps.* 118.22; *b. Sanh.* 38a; *Tanḥ.* 31.4. For further references and discussion see Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 98-99. Cf. Derrett, 'The Stone'; and Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 135.

47. Besides Lk. 20.17-18 stone texts are grouped together in Rom. 9.32-33 (Isa. 8.14; 28.16) and 1 Pet. 2.6-8 (Isa. 8.14; 28.16; Ps. 118.22). It seems likely that Jesus gave the impetus to his followers of using and grouping 'stone' texts for christological significance. For a concise study of the stone *testimonia* in the NT (Mk 12.10-11 and pars.; Acts 4.11; Rom. 9.32-33; Eph. 2.19-22; 1 Pet. 2.6-8), see, e.g., F.F. Bruce, 'New Wine in Old Wine Skins: III. The Corner Stone', *ExpTim* 84 (1973), pp. 231-35. Cf. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, pp. 35-36.

text (Isa. 5.2, סקל, to clear of stones)[48] in conformity to the practice of explicit midrash patterns. And in Luke's version he introduces the citation[49] with 'but' (δέ), an exegetical term that may be used to correct, qualify or emphasize a citation, and a *pesher*-like formula (in a slightly altered question form),[50] a formula that sometimes was used to introduce an explanation after cited texts or a citation explaining an event.[51]

In the citation of these texts Jesus also does a אבן/בן (son/stone) wordplay,[52] a wordplay found typically in the OT and Jewish

48. The keyword סקל of Isa. 5.2 was likely omitted here as a result of the transmission of the tradition or the incorporation of it into the Gospels. Yet Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, p. 116, says that it was a rabbinic method to imply the context of a citation. Similarly, Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, p. 126, has stressed that in the NT verses or phrases from the OT were quoted as pointers to the whole context. Ellis, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 158 n. 41, thinks that סקל was probably in the original form of the midrash since the Gospel tradition tends to reduce OT references.

49. The IF ἀνέγνωτε of Mt. 21.42/Mk 12.10 contrasts to that in Luke, and it is an IF only spoken by Jesus in the NT.

50. Although the *pesher* formula is somewhat altered, the *pesher* fulfillment motif is certainly present. See Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 70-71, who calls *pesher* exegesis a 'this is that' fulfillment motif and finds it to be Jesus' most characteristic employment of Scripture.

51. For further explanation and examples of the *gezerah shawah*, explicit midrash patterns, exegetical terms, and formulas see the sections on these in Chapter 2 above.

52. This supposes a Hebrew/Aramaic original since this wordplay only works in Hebrew/Aramaic (yet the 'stone' word links noted above also work in Greek). See, e.g., the following who recognize this wordplay: J. Lightfoot, *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979 [1859]), II, p. 435; P. Carrington, *According to Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), p. 256; Finkel, 'Pesher of Dreams', p. 367; Black, 'Christological Use', pp. 11-14; Ellis, 'Midrash', p. 194 n. 33; and Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 63-65, 113-18. Cf. S. Kim, 'Jesus—The Son of God, the Stone, the Son of Man and the Servant', in G.F. Hawthorne and O. Betz (eds.), *Tradition and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), pp. 134-48, who alleges that a more complex use of the OT is behind Jesus' wordplay and use of stone texts than Isa. 5.1-2 and suggests that Zech. 3.8-9, 4.7-10, 6.12-13, 9.1–14.21 functioned as a bridge for various self-identifications of Jesus here and elsewhere. For an argument for the preresurrection authenticity of the OT elements on the basis of the wordplay, see Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 62-65, 118; Kim, 'Jesus', pp. 135-38; and Black, 'Christological Use', pp. 13-14.

writings,[53] and by this wordplay he closely ties together the citation and parable.[54] Via the rejected and judging son/stone wordplay, he makes the following christological claims along with his warning of judgment.[55] (1) More clearly than in the parable proper, he makes an indirect yet pointed claim to be the messianic Son of God, who has been rejected by the Jewish religious leaders (Ps. 118.22a). (2) He adds the exaltation theme to the rejection motif made earlier in the parable proper (Ps. 118.22b).[56] (3) And he gives a stern warning to the leaders who oppose him, the son/stone, that they will be judged by destruction at the parousia (Isa. 8.14-15; Dan. 2.34-35, 44-45), and with this warning he joins eschatology to Christology.[57]

The Reaction of the Temple Authorities (v. 19). Because the temple authorities finally realize that Jesus has spoken the parable against them, they decide to take action against Jesus, but they hesitate for the time being due to Jesus' popularity with his audience.

As noted above, an allusion to Isa. 5.1-7 provided the starting point for Jesus' parable. While Isaiah directed his parable against 'the house of Israel and the men of Judah' (Isa. 5.7), Jesus directed his parable against the religious authorities (Lk. 20.19). In considering how the Jewish temple authorities took the parable as applying to themselves,

53. Exod. 28.9-29; 39.6-14; Jos. 4.6-21; 1 Kgs 18.31; Isa. 54.11-13; Lam. 4.1-2; Zech. 9.16; their Targums; *b. Sem.* 47-48; Josephus, *War* 5.6.3 §272. Cf. *Exod. R.* 20.9; 46.2; *Lam. R.* 4.1; *Est. R.* 7.10; 1QH 6.26; 7.8; 1QS 8.5-9; 4QpISd. It also is reflected in Lk. 19.39-40; Mt. 3.9/Lk. 3.8.

54. This connection is strengthened by the equation of the tenants with the builders since 'builders'was a frequent rabbinic designation for religious leaders (e.g., *b. Šab.* 114a; *b. Ber.* 64a). See, e.g., Jeremias, 'λίθος', p. 274; Derrett, 'The Stone', pp. 184-85; and Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, p. 96. Otherwise: e.g., Leaney, *Luke*, p. 251; and Creed, *Luke*, p. 246, miss the wordplay and question the connection between the parable and the citation.

55. Since Ps. 118 like other royal psalms was given messianic import by Judaism and since Isa. 8.14-15 describes Yahweh, Jesus' application has christological implications.

56. The rejection-exaltation theme of Ps. 118.22 has a vital role in the passion predictions: Mk 8.10 pars.; 9.12 par.; 9.31 pars.; 10.33 pars. See Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, pp. 99-102. Johnson, *Luke*, p. 309, notes that Luke's omission of Ps. 118.23 that appears in Matthew and Mark heightens the motif of rejection.

57. Jeremias, 'λίθος', p. 275, says, 'Jesus directs it against His opponents as a word of eschatological threat and a summons to repentance'. See also Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 135.

B.D. Chilton offers an insightful suggestion based on the Isaiah Targum. Although the literary context of the parable in the temple controversies helps explain their reaction, Chilton contends that the interpretation found in the Targum of Isa. 5.1-7 suggests that Jesus' parable would have been taken this way even apart from its literary context. He points out that the Targum of Isa. 5.2 inserts 'sanctuary' and the 'altar' in place of tower and wine vat as part of God's preparation of the vineyard, giving the passage a cultic reading and suggesting that it came to be understood as a judgment against the temple leaders, and that the Targum's interpretation is supported by *Suk.* 49a. Therefore, he concludes 'that the basis of the parable is a complaint about the Temple leadership, an element which the Evangelists convey only by the literary context they provide, but which was immediately obvious to Jesus' first hearers, because they understood his imagery in terms of the targumic rendering of Isaiah'.[58]

A Proem-like Commentary Pattern

In its literary form the Lk. 20.9-18 pericope is a *proem*-like midrash on Isa. 5.1-2,[59] its opening text, which is expounded by a parable and concluded with additional texts (Ps. 118.22; Isa. 8.14-15; Dan. 2.34-35, 44-45). The passage joins both the parable to the texts and the texts to each other by catchwords. It has a somewhat looser pattern than the more stylized rabbinic *proem* midrashim that may be due to such factors as an earlier stage in the practice, an adaptation of the form by Jesus, different theological emphases, and an abbreviation and other possible minor alterations of the commentary before its

58. Chilton, *A Galilean Rabbi and his Bible*, pp. 111-14. Cf. Evans, *Noncanonical Writings*, pp. 182-83. For a study and English translation of the Isaiah Targum, see B.D. Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987). On the relation of the NT writings and the Targums, see, e.g., R. Le Déaut, *The Message of the New Testament and the Aramaic Bible* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982). On the current state of Targum studies, see, e.g., Alexander, 'Jewish Aramaic Translations of the Hebrew Scriptures', pp. 217-53.

59. This has been recognized by Ellis, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', pp. 157-58; *idem*, 'New Directions', p. 251; *idem*, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 98, 135; followed by Blomberg, *Parables*, p. 251. For a discussion of this pattern and examples from the rabbis, Philo and the NT, see the section in Chapter 2 on explicit midrash.

incorporation into its present context.[60] Yet Lk. 20.9-18 clearly portrays a *proem*-like midrash that has the following form.[61]

1. Verse 9: initial text: Isa. 5.1-2 reduced to an allusion[62]
2. Verses 10-16: exposition by means of a parable, verbally linked to Isa. 5.1, 2 by ἀμπελῶν (vv. 9, 15a, 15b, 16)
3. Verses 17-18: final texts: a citation of Ps. 118.22 and allusions to Isa. 8.14-15; Dan. 2.34-35, 44-45 verbally connected by λίθος and linked to Isa. 5.2 (v. 9 [Isa. 5.2, סקל], vv. 17, 18)

Conclusions

The following conclusions may be drawn from our analysis of Jesus' exposition of Isaiah 5.

1. Jesus used several Jewish exegetical techniques in the Lukan version of his exposition of Isa. 5.1-2: a *proem*-like midrash pattern, the *gezerah shawah* in tying the OT texts together, the son/stone wordplay, the exegetical term 'but' (δέ), and a *pesher*-like formula.

2. Jesus employed the OT in a typological and prophetic manner in this exposition. He made a *pesher*-like claim to be the OT's rejected and judging stone,[63] and he pictured himself as a type of rejected servant of God who, due to his sonship, is in a different class than the previous servants.[64]

60. Abbreviations and minor alterations are apparent in a comparison of the three Synoptic versions, if it is assumed that they used the same tradition(s). Cf. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 97.

61. Additional word links are preserved in the midrashic pattern of Mt. 21.33-44 that do not appear in Luke (or Mark), οἰκοδομεῖν (vv. 33, 42; cf. Mk 12.1, 10) and λίθος/λιθοβολεῖν (vv. 42, 44, cf. v. 35). These word links suggest that the fuller Matthaean version preserves the more original midrashic pattern and that the Lukan form has been abbreviated. Cf. Ellis, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 159 n. 44.

62. Ellis, 'New Directions', pp. 251-52 n. 59, posits that Ps. 118.22 may allude to the Pentateuchal text for the day (Exod. 17.4-6 in which Moses was threatened with stoning) and, thus, conform more closely to the *proem* pattern in the rabbinica.

63. See Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 70-71; and France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 98-99, 152-53. Otherwise: Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive*, pp. 171-73.

64. Bock, *Proclamation*, pp. 126-27. Cf. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 69-70, who sees Jesus' use of Isa. 5 as a type of Jewish unbelief and its punishment.

3. The parable had a juridical function, similar to those of the OT prophets, as a word of warning and judgment to the religious leaders who rejected him. And it implicitly gives several christological teachings: a Son of God Christology, the rejection-exaltation theme, the Son/stone Christology, and a presentation of Jesus as the final messenger from God. Through the OT texts, it also provides a veiled, yet pointed forecast of Jesus' parousia and thereby ties eschatology to Christology.

4. Although the general form and details of the parable are verified by the rabbinic evidence, the *proem*-like pattern with its catchword connections and the son/stone wordplay strengthen the arguments both for the parable's unity and for its pre-resurrection origin as a set piece of exposition from the beginning.

5. Jesus' use of the stone texts and of the son/stone wordplay here certainly provided the impetus for the Christian leaders' later use and grouping of the stone *testimonia* in Acts 4.11, Rom. 9.32-33, Eph. 2.20 and 1 Pet. 2.4-8. In consideration of the argument above, this is more likely than the contention of the classical form critics and others that the Evangelists' created this midrash or inserted the OT texts on the basis of later church *testimonia.*

The Exposition on the Resurrection (20.27-40)

The exposition on the resurrection pericope, the second of the four temple debates,[65] appears in each of the Synoptic Gospels (Mt. 22.23-33; Mk 12.18-27; Lk. 20.27-40).[66] Luke's version is quite similar to those of Matthew and Mark at the point of the Sadducees' question (vv. 27-33), but it contains several differences in Jesus' answer to the Sadducees (vv. 34-38) and in the audience's reaction to his answer (vv. 39-40). Specifically, the Lukan account omits Jesus' two rebukes

65. The four temple debates in the Synoptic Gospels concern questions (1) about paying tribute to Caesar, (2) about the resurrection, (3) about the greatest commandment, and (4) about David's Son. The final three debates involve exegetical questions and answers; the third is not recorded by Luke apparently because he reports a similar incident at 10.25-28.

66. For a concise comparison and redactional analysis of the Lukan account premised by Markan priority, see Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1299. For a more detailed study of the alleged Lukan redactional changes from Mark's account, see J.J. Kilgallen, 'The Sadducees and the Resurrection from the Dead', *Bib* 67 (1986), pp. 478-95.

of Mt. 22.29/Mk 12.24, and it adds a few explanatory phrases (vv. 34-35a, 36, 38b), the scribes' approval of his answer (v. 39), and the opponents' decision not to question him further (v. 40; cf. Mt. 22.46; Mk 12.34). A few scholars argue that these additions probably come from Luke's special source,[67] but most scholars think that they come from Luke's redaction.[68] Although these additions may be attributable to Lukan explanation, those holding to this view offer no convincing evidences other than their lack of multiple attestation, a criterion that has been criticized in Chapter 1 above.

This passage is widely held to represent an actual incident in the earthly ministry of Jesus since it appears in the triple tradition, since it lacks specific post-resurrection teachings of the early church, and since there are no convincing reasons that Jesus could not use Jewish exegetical arguments in countering similar arguments.[69] Concerning

67. E.g., Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, pp. 170-71, maintains that vv. 34-36 portray a Semitic style from a variant source of the tradition which Luke substituted for Mk 12.24-26a. Ellis holds to Luke's use of an independent (*Luke*, p. 234) or Q tradition (*Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 116 n. 174; 127 n. 6; 134 n. 25).

68. E.g., F. Nierynck, 'La matière marcienne dans l'évangile de Luc', in F. Nierynck (ed.), *L'évangile de Luc* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1973), pp. 176-77, (*contra* Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, pp. 170-71) calls 20.34b-36, 38b 'a personal enlargement', which replaces the rebuke of Mk 12.24 (= Mt. 22.29) and alludes to the concept of immortality of *4 Macc.* 7.19. Followed by Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1299; and Marshall, *Luke*, p. 738.

69. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, I, p. 184 n. 3, presents two reasons for a pre-easter origin of the account: (1) In Mk 12.24-25 pars. the mode of the resurrection state is described by comparison to angels while the early church referred to the risen Lord not angels (Rom. 8.29; 1 Cor. 15.49; Phil. 3.21). In Mk 12.26-27 pars. the question on the reality of the resurrection is answered via Exod. 3.6 while the early church based it on the resurrection of Jesus (1 Cor. 15.12-14). Followed by Marshall, *Luke*, p. 738, who also argues against Bultmann (cited below) that 'it remains unproven that Jesus did not respond to Jewish arguments by employing counter arguments in the same style'. Similarly, Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1300. For other defenses of the authenticity of the account, see, e.g., O. Schwankl, *Die Sadduzäerfrage (Mk 12,18-27 parr)* (Frankfurt: Athenäum, 1987), pp. 466-587; *idem*, 'Die Sadduzäerfrage (Mk 12,18-27) und die Auferstehungserwartung Jesu', *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 50 (1987), pp. 81-92. *Pace* F. Vouga, 'Controverse sur la résurrection des morts (Marc 12,18-27)', *Lumiere et vie* 35 (1986), pp. 49-61, who is one of the few to argue that all of the passage originated in the church. Cf. Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 26, 63, who thinks that 20.37-39 is an addition to the dialogue 'from the theological material of the Church... one which betrays its

the latter, we would expect Jesus to use such Jewish-style exegesis to defeat his opponents on their own grounds and to gain a hearing with his Jewish audience who required their teachers to base their views on the exposition of Scripture.

The Text Form of the Quotations

Two explicit OT citations appear in this triple tradition narrative: (1) a fusion of portions of Deut. 25.5 and Gen. 38.8 in the Sadducees' question, and (2) Exod. 3.6a (cf. 3.15-16) in Jesus' answer. The text form of Luke's quotations may be analyzed as follows:

Deuteronomy 25.5 and Genesis 38.8 in Luke 20.28

> Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν, ἐάν τινος ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνῃ ἔχων γυναῖκα, καὶ οὗτος ἄτεκνος ᾖ, ἵνα λάβῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ. (Lk. 20.28)
>
> Ἐὰν δὲ κατοικῶσιν ἀδελφοὶ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ἀποθάνῃ εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν, σπέρμα δὲ μὴ ᾖ αὐτῷ, οὐκ ἔσται ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ τεθνηκότος ἔξω ἀνδρὶ μὴ ἐγγίζοντι· ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς εἰσελεύσεται πρὸς αὐτὴν καὶ λήμψεται αὐτὴν ἑαυτῷ γυναῖκα καὶ συνοικήσει αὐτῇ. (Deut. 25.5 LXX)
>
> כי־ישבו אחים יחדו ומת אחד מהם ובן אין־לו לא־תהיה
> אשת־המת החוצה לאיש זר יבמה יבא עליה ולקחה לו לאשה ויבמה:
> (Deut. 25.5 MT)
>
> εἶπεν δὲ Ιουδας τῷ Αυναν Εἴσελθε πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου καὶ γάμβρευσαι αὐτὴν καὶ ἀνάστησον σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου. (Gen. 38.8 LXX)
>
> ויאמר יהודה לאונן בא אל־אשת אחיך ויבם אתה
> והקם זרע לאחיך:
> (Gen. 38.8 MT)

The quotation of Lk. 20.28 (= Mt. 22.24; Mk 12.19) is a summary rendition of the levirate marriage ordinance,[70] consisting of a

origin by its thoroughgoing Rabbinic character'. Similarly, Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 718.

70. Stendahl, *School*, p. 70, says, 'The quotations...can scarcely be regarded as quotations in the strict sense'. Similarly, Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1304, speaks of the conflation as an allusion, abridgment and paraphrase of the OT texts. See also Holtz, *Zitate bei Lukas*, pp. 68-70.

conflation of portions of Deut. 25.5 and Gen. 38.8.[71] The Synoptic quotations vary from the OT and each other; the following are the principal points of difference. (1) Unlike the LXX σπέρμα, the Synoptics have a form of τέκνον, which is closer to the MT בן. (2) By his use of ἐπιγαμβρεύσει Matthew moves from Deut. 25.5 to the wording of Gen. 38.8 sooner than Mark or Luke.

Exodus 3.6 in Luke 20.37

> ὅτι δὲ ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροί, καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐμήνυσεν ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου, ὡς λέγει κύριον τὸν θεὸν Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸν Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸν Ἰακώβ. (Lk. 20.37)
>
> καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρός σου, θεὸς Αβρααμ καὶ θεὸς Ισαακ καὶ θεὸς Ιακωβ. (Exod. 3.6a LXX)
>
> ויאמר אנכי אלהי אביך אלהי אברהם אלהי יצחק ואלהי יעקב
> (Exod. 3.6a MT)

The Synoptics (cf. Mt. 22.32; Mk 12.26) vary slightly from the OT and each other in their quotation of Exod. 3.6a.[72] (1) All three omit τοῦ πατρός σου (אביך) against the OT. (2) Matthew and most Markan manuscripts introduce each θεός phrase with the article, and Luke only has one for the first phrase while the OT does not use the article for any of the phrases. (3) Matthew inserts εἰμι like the LXX; Luke and Mark imply the copula like the MT. (4) Luke renders his version in the accusative case against the nominative of Matthew, Mark and the LXX. (5) Luke adds κύριον, probably from Exod. 3.15-16.[73] (6) Although all three Synoptic versions vary in their IF, both Luke and Mark locate the citation in the works of Moses.

An Exegesis of Luke 20.27-40

As the second of the Synoptic temple debates, the exposition on the resurrection pericope appears in a series of confrontations between

71. *Pace* Archer, *Quotations*, p. 47, who claims there is no resemblance to Gen. 38.8 in the Synoptic quotations.

72. In the NT Exod. 3.6 appears in Lk. 20.37 (pars. Mt. 22.32; Mk 12.26) and Acts 7.32; cf. 3.13.

73. Ellis, *Luke*, p. 237; and Kilgallen, 'The Sadducees', pp. 487-94, think that Luke's citation is from Exod. 3.15(-16) not from 3.6. Yet most fail to see the influence of Exod. 3.15-16 on the Lukan version of the citation.

Jesus and his religious opponents in which they try to entrap or to embarrass him with difficult questions. This account concerns an exegetical discussion in which Jesus thwarts a group of Sadducees by his superior understanding and exegesis of Scripture, as he does in a number of incidents with other opponents.[74] The Lukan version falls into three parts: (1) the Sadducees' question (vv. 27-33), (2) Jesus' answer (vv. 34-38), and (3) his audience's response (vv. 39-40).

The Sadducees' Question (vv. 27-33). The Sadducees,[75] who appear only here in Luke and rarely elsewhere in the Gospels or Acts,[76] rejected the doctrine of the resurrection that was held by Jesus (e.g., Lk. 14.14)[77] because of Epicurean philosophical

74. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 68-70, cites this pericope as one of the instances in which Jesus confounds his religious opponents on their own exegetical grounds. On Jesus' use of Scripture against his Jewish opponents here and elsewhere, see also Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 116-18, 127.

75. For general studies on the Sadducees, see esp. J. Le Moyne, *Les sadducéens* (Paris: Gabalda, 1972); G. Baumbach, 'Der sadduzäische Konservativismus', in J. Maier and J. Schreiner (eds.), *Literatur und Religion des Frühjudentums* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1973), pp. 201-13; Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, pp. 228-32; and the works cited. For studies on the relation of Jesus and the Sadducees, see G. Baumbach, *Jesus von Nazareth im Lichte der jüdischen Gruppenbildung* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1971), pp. 49-71; and K. Müller, 'Jesus und die Sadduzäer', in H. Merklein and J. Lang (eds.), *Biblische Randbemerkungen* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1974), pp. 3-24. For studies on the relation of the Sadducees and the Pharisees, see, e.g., T.W. Manson, 'Sadducee and Pharisee—The Origin and Significance of the Names', *BJRL* (1938), pp. 144-59; and Str–B, IV, pp. 334-52. See also Josephus, *Ant.* 13.5.9 §173, on their rejection of fate; *Ant.* 13.10.6 §§293, 297-98, on their difference from the Pharisees and rejection of the oral law; *Ant.* 18.1.4 §§16-17; *War* 2.8.14 §§164-65, on their various beliefs, such as their rejection of immortality.

76. Besides Lk. 20.27-40 pars., see Mt. 3.7; 16.1, 6, 11-12; 22.34; Mk 12.18; Acts 4.1; 5.17; 23.6-8.

77. The Sadducees' rejection of the resurrection can be seen, e.g., in Acts 23.8 (cf. 4.2); Josephus, *Ant.* 18.1.4 §16; *War* 2.8.14 §165; *b. Sanh.* 90b; *Ab.* 5; *Sanh.* 10.1; *Ber.* 9.5; *Tanḥ.* 3a. See Str–B, I, pp. 885-86; IV p. 334; R. Meyer, 'Σαδδουκαῖος', *TDNT*, VII, p. 47; A. Oepke, 'ἀνίστημι κτλ.', *TDNT*, I, p. 370. In contrast Josephus speaks of the Pharisees' (*War* 2.8.14 §163; 3.8.5 §174; *Ant.* 18.1.3 §14; *Apion* 2.30 §218) and Essenes' (*War* 2.8.11 §154; *Ant.* 18.1.5 §18) belief in the resurrection. On the Jewish belief of the resurrection and immortality see, e.g., Schwankl, *Sadduzäerfrage*, pp. 142-300; Ellis, *Luke*, pp. 234-35; and Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, pp. 1301-302.

dogmas.[78] They questioned Jesus on the reality of the resurrection by posing a problem based on the law of levirate marriage through a conflation of Deut. 25.5 and Gen. 38.8.[79] In their hypothetical problem that was aimed both at refuting and at ridiculing the doctrine of the resurrection, they cite an ordinance from the books of Moses since they gave primacy to the pentateuchal books and since they rejected the oral Torah that was affirmed by the scribes and Pharisees.[80]

According to D. Daube, they asked a type of rabbinic, mocking question, which was intended to ridicule the teaching of Jesus.[81] That they are ridiculing Jesus' belief in the resurrection is evident from the preposterous situation that they cite to prove that the doctrine of the resurrection is ludicrous.[82] A woman's husband dies, leaving her

78. Several rabbinic references associate the Sadducean denial of the resurrection with Epicurean philosophy: e.g., *Sanh.* 10.1; *b. Roš Haš.* 17a; *Sifre Num.* 112 on Num. 15.31; J. Neusner (ed.), *The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), pp. 47-48. See G. Deutsch, 'Apikoros', *JewEnc*, I, pp. 665-66; Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 127 n. 7, and the literature cited.

79. Levirate marriage was a practice in which a brother-in-law fathered a male heir in his brother's name with his brother's widow if the brother died without one; the term 'levirate' comes from the Latin *levir*, 'husband's brother, brother-in-law'. For studies of levirate marriage, see, e.g., M. Burrows, 'Levirate Marriage in Israel', *JBL* 59 (1940), pp. 23-33; and *idem*, 'The Marriage of Boaz and Ruth', *JBL* 59 (1940), pp. 445-54. In the OT see Deut. 25.5-10 (cf. Gen. 38.8-10; Ruth 3.9–4.12) and in the Jewish literature see Str–B, I, pp. 886-87; *Yebamot*, the Mishnaic tractate that deals with these matters; and Josephus, *Ant.* 4.8.23 §§254-56, which speaks as if it were still practiced in the first century. Yet some scholars contend that it was not practiced in Jesus' day: e.g., Creed, *Luke*, p. 248; Caird, *Luke*, p. 224; and Talbert, *Reading Luke*, p. 194.

80. Although several scholars think that the Sadducees only accepted the Torah as Scripture (e.g., Caird, *Luke*, p. 224; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, p. 194; and Stein, *Luke*, p. 503), they offer no evidence. Against this supposition see Josephus, *Apion* 1.8 §§38-42 and 4QMMT B 2.9-11; the latter was written to the temple authorities who included Sadducees and argued from three or four divisions of the OT. See the discussion of these texts in Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 7-8, 10. Cf. Plummer, *Luke*, p. 467.

81. Daube, *Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 159-69, esp. 159-60, calls the rabbinic form a question of *baruth* (vulgarity), a question designed to ridicule a belief of a rabbi, and lists the following rabbinic examples of questions of *baruth* on the resurrection: *b. Nid.* 69b-70b; *b. Sanh.* 90b. Followed by Marshall, *Luke*, p. 737.

82. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1303, thinks, 'The address [of Jesus as

childless, as do his six brothers who unsuccessfully performed the levirate duty; then, the woman died. In the resurrection to which of the seven husbands will the woman be married?[83] By this question they imply that polyandry is the only solution to the proposed problem, and that since it was not allowed among the Jews, the doctrine of the resurrection is excluded by the law of Moses.[84] Because of their rejection of the resurrection on Epicurean grounds, they were not actually asking a serious question, but they were posing a far-fetched situation to make belief in the resurrection look ridiculous.

Since the Sadducees liked to torment the Pharisees with resurrection riddles, the question that they posed for Jesus to answer may have been a stock question. Similar casuistic questions of the Sadducees on the doctrine of the resurrection that were designed to ridicule this doctrine appear in the rabbinic writings. For example, *b. Nid.* 70b deals with the question, which is actually a gibe, of whether persons who are resurrected will require a ritual cleansing because of contact with a corpse.

Jesus' Answer (vv. 34-38). In Jesus' answer to the Sadducees' resurrection problem, he refutes them by asserting some essential differences between the present life and the resurrection life (vv. 34-36), and by providing a proof for the resurrection from the Torah (vv. 37-38).[85]

teacher] may be ironic, but they may also be acknowledging his authority as an interpreter of the Mosaic Law'.

83. Cf. Tob. 3.8 where the number seven is used of repeated marriages and Tob. 6.9-12 and 7.12-13 where the idea of levirate marriage is present in the story. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 740, suggests that the Sadducees may have adapted the story from the popular version in Tobit.

84. Caird, *Luke*, p. 224, aptly states, 'The Sadducees, no doubt, would have argued that, since the commandment was in the Torah, and since it made belief in resurrection absurd, therefore the Torah excluded belief in an afterlife'.

85. In Lk. 20.34 the rebuke of Mt. 22.29/Mk 12.24 that the Sadducees neither know the Scriptures nor the power of God is omitted. Concerning the Sadducees' incorrect exegesis, Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 127, observes that 'since these trained theologians memorized the Bible by the book, Jesus is not ascribing their theological error to an ignorance of the words of the Bible but to a lack of understanding of its meaning. That is, the "word of God" character of Scripture, its divine truth, is not found merely by quoting it but by discerning its true import.'

First, in contrasting the conditions of life in this age with those of the resurrection life in the age to come,[86] Jesus claims that people do not marry[87] in the age to come because they are immortal (vv. 34-36). He implies that without death there is no need for procreation and levirate marriage,[88] and that the problem they posed rather than his doctrine of the resurrection was absurd for it was based on a conception of the resurrection life as a mere extension of the present existence with the same earthly conditions. Because their question involved a misconception of resurrection life, he shows that their question rather than the doctrine is invalid.

In Luke's version Jesus explains that those who are resurrected to the age to come, aptly called 'sons of the resurrection', cannot die anymore because they are 'equal to angels',[89]and 'sons of God'. By

86. Lk. 20.35 has τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου and implies the Jewish contrast between the two aeons. See further Chapter 3 n. 223 on Lk. 18.30 where Jesus referred to the age to come in a lesson on the kingdom of God.

87. The MSS vary with regard to γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται of 20.34 as several MSS substitute or add γεννῶνται καὶ γεννῶσιν. The variant reading captures the essence of Jesus' point that deals with procreation rather than marriage as a whole, and it is preferred by such scholars as Grundmann, *Evangelium nach Lukas*, p. 375; and Ellis, *Luke*, p. 236; cf. Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 716. Otherwise: e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1305. See Marshall, *Luke*, p. 741, for a list of the variant readings and proponents of each.

88. Although the traditional interpretation is that in the resurrection life earthly marriages are abolished (see, e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1300; and Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 715), Jesus only says that no future marriages will occur. In contrast to the view of the abolition of earthly relationships, Marshall, *Luke*, p. 741, alleges, 'It is more likely, however, that the marriage relationship is transcended in a new level of personal relationships, and the basic point being made is that marriage as a means of procreation is no longer necessary'. Similarly, Caird, *Luke*, p. 224; and Kilgallen, 'The Sadducees', pp. 482-87. Otherwise: M. Wiles, 'Studies in Texts: Luke 20.34-36', *Theology* 60 (1957), pp. 500-502, argues that Jesus is saying that in heaven we will be married to everybody rather than to nobody.

89. Johnson, *Luke*, p. 317, comments that 'like the angels' is 'a subtle dig at another belief not held by the Sadducees'.

On the phrase 'equal to angels', cf. Philo, *Sacr.* 5; 2 *Bar.* 51.10; 1QH 3.21-23; 6.13; 1QSb 4.24-28; *1 En.* 15.6; 104.4-6. M. Harris, *From Grave to Glory* (Grand Rapids: Academie Books, 1990), pp. 395-97, thinks that 'equal to angels' means (1) that the resurrection body will have no sexual passions or procreative powers not that the existing marital relationships or sexual distinctions will be destroyed and (2) that it will be immune from death. *Pace* Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1305, who holds to a body-soul dualism and interprets this phrase as 'disembodied spirits who

these comparisons he argues that the fact of immortality in the resurrection life makes the procreation of heirs and the levirate marriage unnecessary.

Secondly, after he has shown that the Sadducean objection to the resurrection is invalid, Jesus argues for the reality of the resurrection through a citation and a brief exegesis of Exod. 3.6. Like the Sadducees who argued from Moses against the resurrection, he too bases his argument for the resurrection on Moses and thereby turns the argument from Moses back on them (καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐμήνυσεν ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου; cf. Exod. 3.2).[90] By citing Exod. 3.6, he demonstrates that even Moses implied the reality of the resurrection: since Yahweh still spoke of himself as the God of the patriarchs after their deaths, he implies that they still must be alive in some sense, and/or that he will raise them from the dead.[91]

In the OT the formula 'the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob' generally was used to refer to God as the savior and protector of Israel because of his covenant relationship to the patriarchs and their descendants. In certain prayers and writings of Jesus' day the formula was applied to claim the same covenant benefits for the present generation (cf. Acts 3.13; Heb. 11.16). By the use of the covenant formula Jesus claims that God will deliver the patriarchs from death because of their continuing covenant relationship, and he shows that the Sadducees erred because they did not understand the link between God's covenant relationship and the resurrection.[92] Jesus, like

do not marry'. However, Fitzmyer seems to miss the point as the comparison does not deal with anthropology but with immortality. Cf. Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 715.

90. Once again (see the discussion of 20.17 above) Luke's form of the IF is different from Matthew and Mark's familiar form of οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 742, notes that ἐπί means 'in the passage about'. Ellis, *Luke*, p. 236, says that this IF was given to locate the passage in their Bible which had no chapter and verse divisions. Cf. *idem*, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 148.

91. See Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 742-43.

92. F. Dreyfus, 'L'argument scripturaire de Jésus en faveur de la résurrection des morts (Marc, xii,26-27)', *RB* 66 (1959), pp. 213-24. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 738, 42. Dreyfus is extended by J.G. Janzen, 'Resurrection and Hermeneutics', *JSNT* 23 (1985), pp. 43-58, who speculates that there is a play on words on 'raise up': the Sadducees asked that if God cannot raise up children for a dead man by a law in the Torah, how can he raise up a dead man in resurrection for which the Torah has no provision; Jesus answered by showing that the ancestors were born despite sterility. Others also see Jesus' argument based on the eternal

contemporary expositors who saw the patriarchs as a prototype and guarantee of God's dealings with Israel, also implies that as the resurrection of the patriarchs is certain because of their continuing covenant relationship so is the resurrection of the covenant people, Israel.[93]

In his brief commentary on the quotation Jesus concludes that 'only living people can have a God, and therefore God's promise to the patriarchs that he is/will be their God requires that he maintain them in life'.[94] In a statement peculiar to Luke, Jesus speaks an additional phrase as the basis for his argument: 'for all live to him'.[95] This saying has a close parallel in *4 Macc.* 7.19 and 16.25, which claims that the martyrs, like the patriarchs, do not die but live to God and

covenant relationship of God and the patriarchs: e.g., Geldenhuys, *Luke*, p. 511; Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 719; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, pp. 194-95; and Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, p. 21. And Ellis, *Luke*, p. 236, suggests, 'It may be that Jesus' confidence in his own resurrection (as Messiah) rested ultimately in such Scriptures as this word of God to Moses'.

93. H. Odeberg, ''Ιακώβ', *TDNT*, III, pp. 191-92; and Ellis, *Luke*, p. 235.

94. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 743; followed by Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, pp. 1306-307.

95. There are two schools of thought on the meaning of 'all live to him': (1) The traditional view is that the patriarchs live despite their deaths because they are immortal. This view involves the difficulties that it implies a body-soul dualism and immortality (of the soul) rather than the resurrection. (2) E.E. Ellis, 'Jesus, the Sadducees and Qumran', *NTS* 10 (1964), pp. 274-79; cf. *idem*, *Luke*, pp. 234-37, thinks that the first view 'would defeat the precise point of Jesus' argument. If Abraham is now personally "living", no resurrection would be necessary for God to be "his God".' In turn, he suggests that Jesus held to the OT and Sadducean view of Sheol and that God's covenant relation with the dead assumes that it will be actualized by deliverance from Sheol. Against the traditional view that finds immortality in Lk. 20.38b, he finds support for his position in Paul's ἐν/σὺν χριστῷ motif; that is, at death the Christian corporately exists in Christ and then receives an individual actualization at the parousia. Ellis is criticized by Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, pp. 1301, 1307, (a) for reducing Jesus' double answer (resurrection and immortality) to a single one and (b) for importing a Pauline idea which is not in Luke's perspective. Cf. Evans, *Saint Luke*, pp. 719-20. Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 738, 42-43, offers similar criticisms and writes, 'More probably the argument is not concerned with the niceties of Sheol, immortality and resurrection, but simply asserts that God will raise the dead because he cannot fail to keep his promises to them that he will be their God'.

teaches that these dead men are alive to God because he gives them life.[96]

In his exegesis Jesus proves his case in a typically rabbinic fashion by means of the following rabbinic techniques. (1) He bases his argument on the present tense of the copula of Exod. 3.6a and thereby uses an argument similar to many rabbinic arguments that hung on the strength of a single word (e.g., *b. Sanh.* 90b). That is, at the moment that God is speaking to Moses he is still the God of the long dead patriarchs who consequently must still live.[97] (2) By employing Hillel's third rule (*binyan 'ab mikatub 'ehad*), a general principle from one verse,[98] he infers that as God has affirmed his covenant relationship with the dead patriarchs he also will resurrect all the dead who have the same covenant relationship with him.[99] (3) He introduces Exod. 3.6 with a formula that indicates that he will cite Moses to counter the Sadducees' argument from Moses. (4) He introduces and follows Exod. 3.6 with the exegetical term 'but' (δέ), a term that may follow a biblical citation to correct, qualify or underscore a particular understanding of it, and that may introduce a biblical citation

96. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1307 (cf. 1301), claims that Luke's statement undoubtedly alludes to *4 Macc.* 7.19 and sees both sayings as clear expressions of the immortality of the patriarchs. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 743, sees a parallel in thought to the apocryphal sayings but is less certain about its line of thought. Cf. Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 719; and Leaney, *Luke*, p. 254. Yet unlike the NT *4 Maccabees* has been influenced by Platonic philosophy and avoids references to the resurrection body.

97. See, e.g., Plummer, *Luke*, p. 471; Evans, *Saint Luke*, pp. 718-19; Marshall, *Luke*, p. 742; Caird, *Luke*, p. 224; Ellis, *Luke*, p. 235; Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, pp. 105-106; Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, p. 21; and Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 68-69. Otherwise: F. Manns, 'La technique du *Al Tiqra* dans les évangiles', *RevScRel* 64 (1990), pp. 1-7, proposes that Jesus used the exegetical technique *al tiqra* (do not read... but) and intended that the consonants of יהוה of Exod. 3.15 be taken as a *hiphil* of the verb היה and read 'God makes Abraham exist'. Similarly, S. Bartina, 'Jesús y los saduceos', *EstBíb* 21 (1962), pp. 151-60.

98. For further detail and examples from Judaism and the NT, see the section on Hillel's rules in Chapter 2 and the works cited.

99. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 89, 131. Similarly, F.G. Downing, 'The Resurrection of the Dead', *JSNT* 15 (1982), pp. 42-50, sees Jesus using Hillel's third rule and finds a parallel to Jesus' argument based on God's covenant relationship in Philo, *Abr.* 50-55. Otherwise: D.M. Cohn-Sherbok, 'Jesus' Defense of the Resurrection of the Dead', *JSNT* 11 (1981), pp. 64-73.

to correct, qualify or underscore a preceding statement or citation.[100]

The rabbis presented exegetical arguments similar to Jesus' in support of the doctrine of the resurrection (e.g., *b. Sanh.* 90b-91a). They appealed to such passages as Exod. 6.4; 15.1; Num. 15.31; 18.28; Deut. 31.16; Job 19.26; Ps. 16.9, 11; Isa. 26.19. In one first-century example, Rabbi Gamaliel was asked by sectarians (*minim*) to support the doctrine of the resurrection from Scripture (*b. Sanh.* 90b). At first he tried to prove the resurrection from the law (Deut. 31.16), prophets (Isa. 26.19) and writings (Song 7.9) but had no success with persuading his hearers. He finally convinced them with an exegesis of Deut. 11.9 in which he argued that the Lord's promise to give the promised land to the now dead patriarchs could only be fulfilled by their resurrection.[101]

The Audience's Response (vv. 39-40). Unlike Matthew and Mark, Luke provides the response of Jesus' audience to his exegesis of Exod. 3.6. First, the scribes compliment his answer, presumably because of his skillful exegesis in solving the Sadducees' difficult problem and because of their agreement on the reality of the resurrection. Secondly, Luke adds that no one dared to question him further, apparently because of their recognition of his superior exegetical abilities.[102]

100. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 84-86, discusses this term in Jewish and NT writings and cites Lk. 20.37-38 as an example of its use following a citation. Yet it may also have been used here as an introductory term to emphasize that his argument was grounded in a passage from Moses. See also the use of this term to introduce a citation in my analysis of Lk. 20.17 above.

101. See, e.g., Moore, *Judaism*, II, pp. 377-83; Str–B, I, pp. 885-97; Oepke, 'ἀνίστημι κτλ.', *TDNT*, I, pp. 368-72; and Daube, *Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 429, for rabbinic discussions on the afterlife.

102. Most scholars see Lk. 20.39-40 as a redactional creation. E.g., Marshall, *Luke*, p. 743; and Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 720, propose that Lk. 20.39 is taken from Mk 12.28, 32, and Lk. 20.40 is brought forward from Mk 12.34. Yet the statement of 20.40 seems to be a traditional, floating *logion* because it appears in a different temple debate in each of the Synoptics, and the saying of 20.39 may be from an independent tradition as noted above.

A Yelammedenu-like Commentary Pattern

A *yelammedenu*-like midrash pattern appears in Lk. 20.27-40.[103] In Luke this pattern (or variations of it) has previously occurred in theological discussions between Jesus and other Jewish theologians or lay inquirers on such topics as the halakah (e.g., Lk. 6.1-5), disputed issues and doctrines (e.g., Lk. 10.25-37) and matters of personal faith (e.g., Lk. 18.18-30). As a debate on a disputed doctrine, Lk. 20.27-40 has affinities to this pattern in its question and answer format and in its Scripture citations; it may be analyzed as follows:

1. Verses 27-28: a quotation of Deut. 25.5; Gen. 38.8 by the Sadducees
2. Verses 29-33: a question based on the citation by the Sadducees
3. Verses 34-38: an answer by Jesus via an initial explanation and a quotation and exegesis of Exod. 3.6

As in the passages analyzed above, the pattern in Lk. 20.27-40 lacks complete conformity to its more stylized rabbinic counterparts (e.g., length and catchword connections) probably because of such factors as an abbreviation in the traditioning process, an adaptation of the form by Jesus to the particular situation, and the earlier stage in the use of the pattern.

Conclusions

The following conclusions emerge from my analysis of the expository debate between Jesus and some Sadducees on the doctrine of the resurrection.

1. Jesus employed several Jewish exegetical techniques in his argument for the resurrection: (a) a *yelammedenu*-like midrash pattern, (b) Hillel's third rule, a general principle from one verse, (c) an IF that indicates that he will use Moses to counter the Sadducees' argument from Moses, (d) the exegetical term 'but' (δέ). Also, (e) his stress on the present tense of the copula as a basis for his argument is similar to rabbinic arguments that hung on a single word.

103. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 116 n. 174, calls Lk. 20.27-40 a *yelammedenu*-type commentary pattern. Cf. *idem*, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 159 n. 44. For more detail on the *yelammedenu* midrashim in Judaism and the NT, see the section on explicit midrash in Chapter 2 and the works cited.

2. When approached by the Sadducees who rejected the resurrection and thus posed an alleged problem against it from the Torah, Jesus defends the doctrine of the resurrection through his superior understanding and exegesis of the Torah. First, by his explanation of life in the resurrection he criticizes the absurdity of their question which was based on the popular conception of the resurrection as an extension of the present earthly existence. Thus, while answering the Sadducees, he also corrects the current Jewish conception of the resurrection. Secondly, by his citation and exegesis of Exod. 3.6 he shows that the covenant relation between Yahweh and the patriarchs necessitates the resurrection of the patriarchs and their descendants. Therefore, via his citation and exegesis of the Torah he defeats them on their own scriptural grounds and by their own exegetical methods in combination with his interpretation.

The Exposition on the Messiah as David's Lord (20.41-44)

The exposition on the messiah as David's Lord, frequently called the question about the son of David, is the last of Jesus' temple debates and his final public controversy with the religious leaders. It appears with minor variations in each of the Synoptic Gospels (Mt. 22.41-46; Mk 12.35-37a; Lk. 20.41-44).[104] As with some of Jesus' other OT expositions in the triple tradition (e.g., Lk. 20.9-19 pars.), Luke's version is the most abbreviated, and Matthew's version is the fullest of the three, adding an introductory dialogue between Jesus and a group of Pharisees and the reaction of his audience.[105] The more detailed narrative of Matthew suggests that the Gospels only preserve a summary of a portion of a larger expository discussion between Jesus and some of his scribal opponents.[106]

104. Most scholars assume that Luke used Mark as his only source for the present pericope. E.g., Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, p. 177; Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 721; Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1309; and Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 743-44.

105. In comparison to Luke, Mark adds references to Jesus' teaching in the temple, the scribes, and the Holy Spirit; besides the introduction and conclusion Matthew adds references to the Pharisees and the Holy Spirit. For a comparison and redactional analysis of the Lukan account based on Markan priority, see Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1309.

106. R.P. Gagg, 'Jesus und die Davidssohnfrage', *TZ* 7 (1951), pp. 18-30, argues (1) that the original form of the account was a controversy dialogue from which the Gospels have only preserved Jesus' answer and (2) that Jesus replied with

Those who hold that the narrative is a church creation question its historicity primarily at two points: (1) because it presents alleged post-resurrection theology,[107] and (2) because its argument seems to rest on the LXX.[108] But several authorities have demonstrated that these objections are without substantial weight and can be readily answered.

First, the claim that the identification of Jesus with the son of David originated with the post-Easter theology of the early church rather than with Jesus has been refuted. Among others, V. Taylor shows that the allusive character of the saying which half conceals and half reveals the 'messianic secret' suggests that the saying originated with Jesus since the early church would not have presented their doctrinal beliefs in such an allusive manner. While the allusive nature of this passage is characteristic of Jesus' messianic claims elsewhere, it stands in contrast to the direct claims made by the apostolic church in such passages as Acts 2.34-36, 5.31, 10.42-43 and Rom. 1.3-4.[109]

an evasive counter question to avoid entrapment and to end the conversation rather than to make a christological point. Followed by C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Gospel according to Saint Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), pp. 380-83. Otherwise: e.g., Hahn, *Titles*, p. 103; Marshall, *Luke*, p. 744; and Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1309. Yet in an earlier essay (*idem*, 'The Son of David Tradition and Mt 22.41-46 and Parallels', in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* [Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974], pp. 123-24) Fitzmyer suggested that the account represents a longer scribal debate that has been abbreviated.

107. E.g., Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 66, 136-37, contends that the account is 'a community product' created either by part of the early church who thought that Jesus was the son of Man rather than the son of David or by the Hellenistic church who wanted to prove that Jesus was both the son of David and the son of God. Similarly, Hahn, *Titles*, pp. 103-106; and G. Schneider, 'Die Davidssohnfrage (Mk 12,35-37)', *Bib* 53 (1972), pp. 81-90, argue for a creation by the Hellenistic church. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, pp. 45-47; and Perrin, *Rediscovering*, pp. 23-24, think that the Gospel account is a product of the early Christian exegesis of Acts 2.34 to prove that Ps. 110.1 was fulfilled in the resurrection and to show that Jesus is Lord not the son of David (i.e., to provide a post-Easter exaltation theme). Cf. W.R.G. Loader, 'Christ at the Right Hand', *NTS* 24 (1978), pp. 214-15.

108. E.g., Hahn, *Titles*, pp. 104-105; and Schneider, 'Davidssohnfrage', pp. 85-86.

109. V. Taylor, *The Gospel according to Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1959), p. 493. Followed, e.g., by Fitzmyer, 'The Son of David Tradition', p. 115; *idem*, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1310. For similar and additional arguments in favor of the preresurrection origin of the saying, see, e.g., O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (trans. S.C. Guthrie and C.A.M. Hall; Philadelphia: Westminster

A second major reason that many adherents of classical form criticism claim that the narrative is a creation of the early church is the supposition that the argument is linguistically dependent on the LXX. That is, since the argument appears to be dependent on a Greek text with its double use of κύριος, and since it appears to be impossible with the Hebrew text which has different words for 'Lord' (נאם יהוה לאדני), it must have originated with the early church rather than with Jesus. Three suggestions that they fail to consider disarm this criticism. (1) J.A. Fitzmyer thinks that Jesus probably was speaking in Aramaic and that the pun on κύριος in the Greek text of Jesus' quotation of Ps. 110.1 may reflect an Aramaic original in which the same pun is possible (אמר מרא למראי).[110] (2) D.L. Bock asserts that since יהוה was not pronounced outside temple cultic contexts, a Hebrew reading with the pun is possible: נאם אדני לאדני.[111] (3) Furthermore, a number of scholars offer evidence that along with Aramaic and Hebrew Jesus could speak Greek[112] which thus would allow the possibility that he could have cited Ps. 110.1 in Greek and made the argument based on the double use of κύριος.

The Text Form of Luke 20.42-43

An explicit quotation of Ps. 110.1 with an IF appears in the triple tradition (Mt. 22.44; Mk 12.36; Lk. 20.42-43);[113] the

Press, rev. edn, 1963), p. 132; Gagg, 'Jesus und die Davidssohnfrage', pp. 20-22; D.M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973), p. 110; France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 100-102; Bock, *Proclamation*, pp. 130-32; E. Lövestam, 'Die Davidssohnfrage', *SEÅ* (1962), pp. 81-82; and Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 746-47, who answers the six objections of Hahn.

110. J.A. Fitzmyer, 'The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament', in *A Wandering Aramean* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979), p. 90; and *idem*, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1312.

111. Bock, *Proclamation*, p. 130, and the works cited on p. 332 n. 160. Yet he does not allow for the possibility that Jesus could have spoken Greek and seems to think that a Greek original would force one to hold to a church creation.

112. See the works cited above in Chapter 3 n. 90.

113. Ps. 110.1 also is cited in Acts 2.34-35 and Heb. 1.13, and it appears in the form of allusions in Lk. 22.69 pars., Acts 7.55, Rom. 8.34, Eph. 1.20, Col. 3.1, Heb. 1.3, 8.1, 10.12, 12.2 and 1 Pet. 3.22. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, pp. 34-35, classifies it as a testimony text, and comments, 'It seems clear, therefore, that this particular verse was one of the fundamental texts of the *kerygma*, underlying almost all the various developments of it'. See Holtz, *Zitate bei Lukas*, pp. 51-53, for an analysis of the text form in Luke–Acts.

Lukan citation may be analyzed as follows:

> [42]αὐτὸς γὰρ Δαυὶδ λέγει ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν· εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου· κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, [43]ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου. (Lk. 20.42-43)

> Τῷ Δαυιδ ψαλμός. Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου. (Ps. 109.1 LXX)

> לדוד מזמור
> נאם יהוה לאדני שב לימיני
> עד־אשית איביך הדם לרגליך׃
> (Ps. 110.1 MT)

Luke's quotation has an exact correspondence with LXX Ps. 109.1, which is a faithful rendering of the MT, except for the lack of ὁ before κύριος.[114] It agrees with Matthew and Mark except for their substitution of ὑποκάτω or LXX ὑποπόδιον, a variation likely influenced by the cognate Ps. 8.7.[115] Luke's IF locates the citation 'in the book of Psalms' while Matthew and Mark speak of David inspired by the (Holy) Spirit.[116]

An Exegesis of Luke 20.41-44

In the final Synoptic temple debate Jesus rather than his religious opponents asks an exegetical question. He stumps them with an exegetical problem that they cannot solve (cf. Mt. 22.46).[117] If in Ps. 110.1 David calls the messiah his Lord, how can the messiah also be David's son?[118] In posing this puzzling problem Jesus asks an initial question

114. In some MSS the article is read, which is probably a copyist's harmonization to the LXX. See Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1315, for a list of the MSS.

115. See, e.g., Stendahl, *School*, p. 78; Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, p. 25; and Holtz, *Zitate bei Lukas*, p. 51 n. 6. Cf. Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive*, pp. 173-74. Yet in Heb. 1.13 and 2.8 both Ps. 110.1 and 8.7 are quoted without the substitution.

116. Given Luke's emphasis on the Spirit elsewhere (cf. Acts 1.16; 4.25) it is interesting that his IF is ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν (cf. Lk. 24.44; Acts 1.20; 13.33) rather than Matthew's ἐν πνεύματι or Mark's ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ. Also, Luke is the only NT writer to refer to the Psalms as a part of Scripture.

117. On the topic of Jesus' exposition of Scripture against his religious opponents by the use of their own exegetical methods, see Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 116-18; and Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 68-70.

118. Jesus poses a puzzle for the scribes in a manner quite similar to the riddle presented to him by the Sadducees in 20.27-40 above.

(v. 41), cites Ps. 110.1 (vv. 42-43), and closes with another question that recapitulates the problem presented in the first question and citation (v. 44).

Jesus' Initial Question (v. 41). Having previously silenced his opponents (20.40), in this episode Jesus initiates a confrontation with some scribes[119] by asking them a theological question: 'How[120] can they say that the Christ is the son of David?' Since both the OT and first-century Judaism taught that the messiah would be a descendent of David,[121] he was asking a pertinent question for an exegetical deliberation. At first, however, he may have appeared to have asked an extremely simplistic question until he complicated it with a citation of Ps. 110.1 and a follow-up question.

Jesus' Citation of Ps. 110.1 (vv. 42-43). Before his opponents have a chance to reply to the first question Jesus quotes Ps. 110.1 and introduces it with an IF (αὐτὸς γὰρ Δαυὶδ λέγει ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν) that 'underlines the exegetical character of the pericope'.[122] He cites Ps. 110.1 to show an apparent contradiction to the biblical attestation that the Christ is David's son, a contradiction that is implicit in the first question but made explicit with the citation and with the second question.[123]

119. Although Luke does not give the identity of the opponents, Mt. 22.12 says that they are Pharisees, and Mk 12.35 mentions the scribes as the subject of the question. In the previous Lukan episode the opponents were Sadducees (20.27-40), but the scribes are the last group mentioned (20.39) which suggests that they are the audience here (20.41: 'But he said to them').

120. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 747, says that πῶς can mean 'in what sense?' or 'how is it possible that?'

121. E.g., 2 Sam. 7.12-16; Ps. 89.20-37; Isa. 9.2-7; 11.1-9; Jer. 23.5-6; 30.8-9; 33.14-18; Ezek. 34.23-24; 37.24; Mic. 5.2; *Pss. Sol.* 17.21; *4 Ezra* 12.32; 1QS 9.11; 4QFlor 1.11-13; 4QPBless 4; *Shemoneh Esreh* 14; *Sanh.* 98a. See C. Burger, *Jesus als Davidssohn* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), pp. 16-24; E. Lohse, 'υἱὸς Δαυίδ', *TDNT*, VIII, pp. 478-88; *idem*, 'Der König aus Davids Geschlecht', in Betz *et al.* (eds.), *Abraham Unser Vater*, pp. 337-45; Fitzmyer, 'The Son of David', pp. 115-21; and Str–B, I, pp. 11-14.

122. Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 721.

123. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 747, writes, 'The question [of 20.41] has implicitly contained the OT evidence that constitutes one part of the apparent contradiction that Jesus is putting before his hearers. The second part is given in the citation.' See also Daube, *Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 160-63.

Jesus' Final Question (v. 44). After the OT quotation, Jesus concludes his enigmatic, messianic problem with a final question: How can the messiah be David's son when David calls him his Lord in Ps. 110.1?[124] In posing this question Jesus assumes that in Ps. 110.1 'the Lord' is God and 'my Lord' is the messiah, that David is the author of the psalm, and that according to Jewish mores a son was not superior to his father. On the basis of the latter assumption he asks how the messiah could be David's son since David would not address his son as Lord.[125] J.A. Fitzmyer, aptly characterizes the sense of the exposition: 'The implication of the second question answers the first. It is not a matter of either/or, but of both/and: Yes, the Messiah is David's son, but he is more: He is indeed David's Lord'.[126]

Like Jesus' religious opponents, who found this saying to be problematic, modern scholars also have experienced difficulty with it.[127] In turn, they have failed to arrive at a consensus as to its meaning.[128] The modern authorities, who have wrestled with this difficult text, have proposed three main interpretations as to the original meaning of Jesus' son of David question. (1) A few authorities think that this saying was given to deny the Davidic sonship of the messiah because Jesus had declared his messiahship, but contrary to the messianic expectation of first-century Jews he was not a descendent of David.[129]

124. His second question is in chiastic arrangement to the first (vv. 41-43).

125. See Talbert, *Reading Luke*, p. 195. Cf. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 163-69, who defends the validity of the following premises on which the argument is based: the person addressed by Yahweh is the messiah, the speaker is David, and the use of the term אדני ('my lord') implies the superiority of the one described.

126. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1310. But he cautions 'that the title "lord" is not given its full resurrection-sense'.

127. Evans, *Saint Luke*, pp. 721-22, comments on the trouble that this pericope has caused modern scholars: 'It is, moreover, so brief and cryptic as to be barely intelligible, so that for all the discussion of it... there is no consensus of opinion on what the precise question is that is being raised, on why it was thought necessary to raise it, and on why the tradition was handed down in this form'.

128. See, e.g., Schneider, 'Davidssohnfrage', pp. 66-81, for a survey of the modern interpretations. For a briefer presentation and critique of the three major interpretations with representatives of each view in addition to those noted below, see Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 743-46; and Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, pp. 1309-14.

129. E.g., Burger, *Davidssohn*, pp. 52-59; and Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 136-37. A. Suhl, 'Der Davidssohn im Matthäus-Evangelium', *ZNW* 59 (1968), pp. 57-81, argues that Mark's account denies Davidic sonship while Matthew's

(2) Most scholars claim that Jesus was denying or qualifying contemporary Jewish expectation of a Davidic messiah by teaching that the messiah is more than a mere son of David since David called him κύριος. For example, D. Daube suggests that Jesus employed a rabbinic method of argumentation in which two Scripture passages that appear to be in contradiction to each other are both shown to be right in their own contexts and that he used Ps. 110.1 to qualify scribal teaching on the messiah as David's son (based on such passages as Isa. 11.1; Jer. 23.5).[130] Similarly, O. Cullmann thinks that Jesus did not deny his Davidic sonship but the Jewish expectation of the messiah as a political king.[131] On the presupposition that the pericope was created by the early church, F. Hahn and others see a two-stage Christology in which Jesus is regarded as David's son during his earthly life and David's Lord during his exaltation.[132] (3) Some commentators extend the second view to specify that Jesus was declaring himself to be the Son of Man of Dan. 7.9-13 because he later combined Ps. 110.1 and Dan. 7.13 in referring to himself (Lk. 22.69 pars.).[133]

View 1 is untenable because the Davidic descent of the messiah is so

asserts it. Cf. B. Chilton, 'Jesus *ben David*', *JSNT* 14 (1982), pp. 88-112, who maintains that Jesus knew he was of Davidic descent but challenged the scribal expectation that the messiah would be the son of David by an exegetical argument in order to evade the charge that he had messianic intentions.

130. Daube, *Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 160-63, classifies Jesus' argument as a certain type of *haggadic* question. Followed, e.g., by Fitzmyer, 'The Son of David Tradition', p. 124; Lohse, 'υἱὸς Δαυίδ', VIII, pp. 484-85; and Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, I, p. 259. Otherwise: e.g., Schneider, 'Davidssohnfrage', pp. 83-85. Cf. W. Grundmann, 'χρίω', *TDNT*, IX, p. 530, who thinks that Jesus raised the question not to deal with his messiahship but to show the difficulty in Scripture 'when the Davidic sonship of the Messiah is brought face to face with the Messiah'.

131. Cullmann, *Christology*, pp. 130-33. Similarly, Hay, *Glory*, p. 111, adds the Messiah's kingdom will not be a mere renewal of David's; France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 100-102, and the works there cited. Cf. Fitzmyer, 'The Son of David Tradition', pp. 124-25; and Bock, *Proclamation*, p. 132. Otherwise: e.g., Hahn, *Titles*, p. 252; and Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 744-45.

132. E.g., Hahn, *Titles*, pp. 251-53; Lohse, 'υἱὸς Δαυίδ', VIII, pp. 484-85; and Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, I, p. 259.

133. E.g., F. Neugebauer, 'Die Davidssohnfrage (Mark xii. 35-37 parr.) und der Menschensohn', *NTS* 21 (1974), pp. 81-108; Hay, *Glory*, pp. 115-16; and Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 745-46.

definite in the OT and in first-century Judaism as are attestations to Jesus' Davidic lineage elsewhere in the Gospels and in the NT[134] that it is inconceivable that Jesus and the early church would have denied it.[135] View 3 is quite speculative and arbitrary because there is no reference to Dan. 7.13 or the Son of Man in this passage although it is found later in Lk. 22.69.[136] Therefore, view 2 is best: Jesus was teaching that the messiah is more than a mere son of David since David called him κύριος in Ps. 110.1. But it is not certain what Jesus intended his original hearers to understand and whether he originally implied all that the early church later understood the saying to mean; yet Luke's readers certainly would have understood the saying to mean that Jesus was both messiah and Lord as stated in Acts 2.25-36. It seems that when Jesus originally spoke these cryptic words he was giving an implicit, veiled claim to be both the promised messiah and the Lord,[137] a claim that only would be understood after his resurrection.[138] That is, Jesus taught that the messiah was indeed the Son of David, but he was also greater than David, Israel's greatest king, for the messiah was David's Lord (cf. Lk. 11.31-32).

Psalm 110 was not given a messianic interpretation in the rabbinic writings until the late third century AD. A number of authorities think that Jewish scholars regarded it as a messianic psalm during the NT era, and that they refrained from a messianic interpretation of it until

134. For a study of the relevant texts on the son of David tradition in the OT, Judaism and the NT, see, e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, pp. 1310-11; and esp. *idem*, 'The Son of David Tradition', pp. 113-26. See also n. 121 above.

135. See, e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1312; and Marshall, *Luke*, p. 744, for additional reasons.

136. See Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1312.

137. On Jesus' veiled expositions of Scripture here and elsewhere, see Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 117 n. 184.

138. See Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1313; Burger, *Davidssohn*, pp. 114-16; and Johnson, *Luke*, p. 315. Similarly, Marshall, *Luke*, p. 745, says, 'Jesus' unanswered question was regarded by Luke as a mystery which found its solution in the resurrection'. Fitzmyer, 'The Son of David Tradition', p. 125, characterizes the more developed understanding of the saying at the time that it was incorporated into the Gospels: 'By that time *Kyrios*, used of Jesus, carried with it the clear suggestion that he was somehow on parallel with Yahweh of the OT'. See also the works cited below in n. 143.

c. AD 260 in reaction to Christian usage.[139] Building on this proposal, R.N. Longenecker suggests that

> he [Jesus] seems to be taking up a somewhat enigmatic passage which possibly had messianic relevance in certain circles of his day, explicating the enigmatic element in the passage and arguing on the basis of David's acclamation that the Messiah must be considered more than just... the 'Son of David'... But in the process, he is also inferring that he thought of himself as 'David's Greater Son', the One to whom even David bowed. And... it seems evident that those who heard him—particularly his disciples—understood him to be engaged in a creative interpretation of Scripture which explicated the enigmatic and applied the import of the passage to himself in a pesher fashion.[140]

An Abbreviated Yelammedenu-like Commentary Pattern

The exposition on the messiah as David's Lord may be classified as an abbreviated *yelammedenu*-like midrash pattern.[141] In the analysis of the passages above a fuller *yelammedenu*-like pattern appears in Lk. 10.25-37, and other abbreviated ones are found in 18.18-30 and in 20.27-40. The present pattern occurs in an abbreviated and somewhat altered form because it seems to be an abridgment of a fuller expository discussion, and because it likely has been adapted to fit Jesus' temple debate expositions, expositions in which he defended his exegesis of Scripture against the attacks of religious opponents. The exposition of 20.41-44 has affinities to the *yelammedenu* pattern in its question and answer format, its Scripture quotation, and its verbal

139. See esp. Str–B, IV, pp. 452-65. Followed, e.g., by Ellis, *Luke*, p. 238; Hay, *Glory*, p. 30; Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, p. 73 n. 57; Bock, *Proclamation*, p. 130; and Geldenhuys, *Luke*, p. 517. Otherwise: e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1311, thinks that the messianic interpretation may have begun with Jesus. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 748-49, who is open to Billerbeck's suggestion because the psalm was frequently used of the messiah by the early church, but he thinks that 'it is possible that Jesus was putting before them a text which they did not previously interpret messianically, and asserting that it was messianic and that it should modify their understanding of messiahship'.

140. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 73-74, classifies this as an instance of Jesus' *pesher* treatment of Scripture (i.e., a 'this is that' fulfillment motif) although it is expressed more inferentially here than elsewhere.

141. See Ellis, 'New Directions', p. 252 n. 62, who compares it to the exegetical patterns in Lk. 10.25-37 and 20.9-19. For an analysis and studies of the *yelammedenu* midrashim in Judaism and the NT, see the section on explicit midrash in Chapter 2.

links between the text and the exposition. It may be analyzed as follows:

1. Verse 41: initial question, implying messianic texts (e.g., Isa. 11.1; Jer. 23.5)
2. Verses 42-43: a quotation of Ps. 110.1 with an IF, verbally linked (Δαυίδ, υἱός, κύριος) to the initial and/or final question
3. Verse 44: concluding question

Conclusions

Several conclusions may be drawn from my analysis of the exposition on the Christ as David's Lord; they are as follows.

1. In his exposition of Ps. 110.1 Jesus used at least two Jewish exegetical methods: (a) an abbreviated *yelammedenu*-like midrash pattern, and (b) a type of *haggadic* question in which two Scripture passages that appear to be in contradiction to each other are both shown to be right in their own contexts.

2. Jesus expounded Ps. 110.1 in a prophetic, *pesher*-like manner by a veiled, implicit identification of himself as both the Davidic messiah and the Lord,[142] an identification that he later made more explicit (Lk. 22.69 pars.) and that the early church recognized and explicitly proclaimed (e.g., Acts 2.34-36).

3. In his implicit claim to be both the Davidic messiah and the Lord, Jesus heightens contemporary Judaism's expectation of the messiah by teaching that the messiah is both a Davidic descendent and the Lord. He criticizes the teaching of the scribes on the messiah and their rejection of him at the exegetical level by employing the same exegetical methods they used.

4. The use of Ps. 110.1 by Jesus here and elsewhere in the Gospels likely provided the impetus for the church's later use of Ps. 110.1 and for their application of the κύριος title to him.[143]

142. Bock, *Proclamation*, p. 132, states that 'Jesus does not explicitly identify himself with the person of Ps. 110 in this pericope but the implication for Luke's readers or Jesus' hearers can hardly be missed'. Cf. Stendahl, *School*, pp. 78-79.

143. See Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, pp. 120-21, who finds Ps. 110.1 as primary for the church's application of the κύριος title to Christ. Otherwise: Hay, *Glory*, pp. 104-21, argues that Ps. 110.1 has a significant association with four christological titles: Lord, Son of Man, son of God, son of David. Yet he does not think (1) that the original concern in Lk. 20.41-44 pars. was with the κύριος title

The Saying on the Coming of the Son of Man in the Eschatological Discourse (21.25-28)

The saying on the coming of the Son of Man occurs as part of the eschatological discourse[144] in each of the Synoptic Gospels (Mt. 24.29-31; Mk 13.24-27; Lk. 21.25-28).[145] Luke's version of the saying has a verbal similarity to Matthew's and Mark's at 21.26b, 27[146] and to a lesser degree at 21.25a. Yet it contains several differences in the remainder of the passage of which the following are the most significant: (1) an omission of their reference to the θλῖψις and an abbreviation of the OT allusions of 21.25a, (2) an addition of the OT allusions of 21.25b-26a, and (3) a substitution of the redemption of the disciples of 21.28 for the gathering of the elect by the angels.

Although many scholars allege that the Lukan additions noted above

(but with 'the son of David'), (2) that Ps. 110.1 was the reason for the Christian use of κύριος, (3) that most early Christians associated the psalm and the title, or (4) that the church's use of Ps. 110.1 was based on Jesus' use.

144. The issues on the Son of Man problem and the eschatological discourse are some of the most complicated ones in the Gospels, and they have produced a myriad of literature. These matters will be excluded from the discussion here to focus on Jesus' exposition of the OT in Lk. 21.25-28. For studies of the Son of Man problem, see I.H. Marshall, 'The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussion' and 'The Son of Man in Contemporary Debate', in *Jesus the Saviour* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1990), pp. 73-120, who surveys works through 1989. For a history of the research on the eschatological discourse, see G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Future* (London: Macmillan, 1954); and D. Wenham, *The Rediscovery of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), pp. 2-6. For a concise summary of the major issues in the Lukan discourse, see Fitzmyer, *Luke, X–XXIV*, pp. 1323-29; and Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 752-58. For a recent analysis of the christological application of the Son of Man of Dan. 7.13 in Lk. 21.25-28, see Bock, *Proclamation*, pp. 133-37.

145. For a brief comparison and redactional analysis of Luke's version based on Markan priority, see Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1328. For a detailed comparison and tradition history of the three Synoptic accounts without a priority assumption, see Wenham, *Rediscovery*, pp. 304-26, 364-69, who concludes (1) that there was an elaborate pre-Synoptic form of the eschatological discourse which was used independently and differently by Matthew, Mark and Luke, (2) that Luke is the most free with the order (cf. 12.35-48; 17.22-37) and with the paraphrasing of the tradition, and (3) that Matthew and Luke also used Mark but less than usually supposed.

146. Mt. 24.30 has an allusion to Zech. 12.10-14 before the citation of Dan. 7.13 which is not found in either Luke or Mark.

are redactional creations,[147] others suggest that these additions, here as elsewhere in the eschatological discourse, demonstrate that Luke used an independent tradition in combination[148] with or possibly instead of the common triple tradition.[149] In the most recent, thorough tradition history of the eschatological discourse in the triple tradition, D. Wenham presents a persuasive argument that there was an elaborate pre-Synoptic form of the discourse that was used independently by the three Synoptic Evangelists.[150] These studies suggest that in 21.25-28 Luke is presenting a summary of a portion of Jesus' eschatological discourse rather than freely creating these sayings.

Several reputable scholars hold to the authenticity of this saying and the whole eschatological discourse.[151] However, many modern scholars, adhering to classical form criticism, regard the entire discourse as a church creation, and they are especially skeptical of the historicity of Lk. 21.25-28 and its parallels.[152] Because this saying is largely

147. E.g., J. Zmijewski, *Die Eschatologiereden des Lukas-Evangelium* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1972), pp. 233-34; R. Geiger, *Die lukanischen Endzeitreden* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1973), pp. 215-33; Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 122-23, 327; Nierynck, 'Matière marcienne', pp. 177-79; Creed, *Luke*, pp. 252-54; and Evans, *Saint Luke*, pp. 732-33, 753-56.

148. E.g., Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, pp. 180-81; L. Gaston, 'Sondergut und Markusstoff in Luk. 21', *TZ* 16 (1960), pp. 161-72; W. Nicol, 'Tradition and Redaction in Luke 21', *Neot* 7 (1973), 61-71; Caird, *Luke*, pp. 227-28; Schlatter, *Evangelium*, pp. 412-20; Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 754-57, 774; and Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, pp. 1325-28. The latter two writers provide a discussion on the sources for the discourse and give additional representatives of each view.

149. E.g., Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Future*, pp. 226-27, and the works there cited. Cf. Manson, *Sayings*, pp. 336-37; and Ellis, *Luke*, p. 242.

150. Wenham, *Rediscovery*. For his conclusions on Lk. 21.25-28, see pp. 304-26; on the entire discourse, see pp. 364-74.

151. E.g., Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Future*, *passim*; *idem*, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen* (New York: Macmillan, 1957), pp. 1-18; F.H. Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), pp. 360-64; Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, pp. 245-48; Wenham, *Rediscovery*, pp. 304-26, 364-69; Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 774-77; Ellis, *Luke*, p. 241; cf. M.D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967), pp. 148-59.

152. E.g., Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 122-23, views the discourse as a combination of Jewish and Christian sayings. L. Gaston, *No Stone on Another* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), pp. 8-64, claims that the discourse is a creation by Christian prophets for eschatological exhortation, and that 21.25-28 is the product of such Christian exegesis. Similarly, C. Colpe, 'ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου', *TDNT*, VIII,

composed of OT allusions, they allege that it must have originated with Christian prophets sometime after the death of Christ. But this contention of a church creation is lacking in force. As argued in Chapter 1, there is little evidence that sayings from the post-resurrection Christ were received by Christian prophets, mixed in the tradition, and then elevated to the status of sayings of the earthly Jesus. Similarly, the supposition that the sayings based on the OT which are ascribed to Jesus must have originated with the early church rather than Jesus is unconvincing.[153] Instead, we should expect the teachings of the earthly Jesus to be based on the OT. It seems more than likely that Jesus would frame this particular teaching on Dan. 7.13 and other OT allusions[154] since he was predicting an eschatological judgment on the temple leaders and those who rejected him as the messiah, and since he offered this word of judgment against Israel as prophetic teacher and messiah. Furthermore, this saying would have the most impact with his Jewish audience if it was based on judgment themes from the OT prophets.

The Text Form of Luke 21.27

In this pericope an explicit quotation of Dan. 7.13 occurs in Lk. 21.27 (= Mt. 24.30; Mk 13.26),[155] and allusions to several OT passages are

p. 450; Perrin, *Rediscovering*, pp. 173-85; H.E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. D.M. Barton; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), pp. 33-36; O.J.F. Seitz, 'The Future Coming of the Son of Man', *SE* (1973), pp. 488-90; and M. Casey, *Son of Man* (London: SPCK, 1979), pp. 165-78, find the presence of the OT references in 21.25-28 as the decisive evidence for an exegetical creation of the church. Besides the OT elements A.J.B. Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), pp. 60-66, rejects the saying because of differences from the Son of Man sayings in Mk 8.38 and 14.62; and B. Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man* (London: SPCK, 1983), pp. 108-10, opposes its authenticity because of the titular use of the Son of Man.

153. Marshall's comment on another passage is quite appropriate here: 'The case that Jesus did not use the OT in the present manner requires jettisoning too much of his teaching to be convincing' (*Luke*, p. 746).

154. Against those who are skeptical that Jesus spoke these words, Marshall states, 'There is good reason to believe that Jesus spoke of the coming of the Son of man in terms of Dn. 7.13, and round this nucleus there has developed... a midrash which portrays the End in greater detail' (*Luke*, p. 774).

155. According to Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, pp. 67-70, in the NT Dan. 7.13 also appears in allusions in Mk 14.62 pars., Rev. 1.7, 13, Acts 1.9-11, 1 Thess. 4.17, and it served as a testimony text for the early church. His list seems

found in the account as Jesus framed this teaching in OT language. Luke's citation of Dan. 7.13 may be analyzed as follows:

> καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλῃ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς. (Lk. 21.27)
>
> ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἤρχετο. (Dan 7.13a-b LXX)
>
> חזה הויתי בחזוי ליליא
> וארו עם־ענני שמיא כבר אנש אתה הוה
> (Dan. 7.13a-b MT)

In this quotation the Synoptic accounts give Dan. 7.13 a paraphrastic rendering,[156] with τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλῃ *peshering* Dan. 7.13b and with μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς reflecting MT Dan. 7.14a (שלטן ויקר ומלכו; cf. LXX ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία). They agree with Theodotion at ἐρχόμενον against the LXX ἤρχετο. Luke differs from Matthew, Mark and the LXX with the singular νεφέλῃ[157] and from Matthew and the LXX with ἐν for ἐπί. Unlike Luke and Mark, Matthew follows νεφελῶν with τοῦ οὐρανοῦ like the OT and adds an allusion to Zech. 12.10-14 (καὶ τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς) before the Dan. 7.13 quotation (cf. Rev. 1.7).[158]

overly conservative since other reputable authorities see several additional allusions in the Gospels: e.g., J.D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980), p. 66, lists the following seventeen: Mk 8.38 pars.; 13.26 pars.; 14.62 pars.; Mt. 19.28/Lk. 22.30; Mt. 24.27/Lk. 17.24; Mt. 24.37/Lk. 17.26; Mt. 24.44/Lk. 12.40; Mt. 10.23; 13.41; 16.28; 24.39; 25.31; Lk. 12.8; 17.22, 30; 18.8; 21.36. The NA26 text also lists Rev. 14.14.

156. Although this reference is classified as an explicit quotation in both the UBS3 and the NA26 Greek texts, most scholars see it as an allusion: E.g., Archer, *Quotations*, p. 141; and Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, pp. 52-54. Holtz, *Zitate bei Lukas*, does not treat it presumably because of its allusive nature. Stendahl, *School*, pp. 213-14, does not discuss it in his chapter on the text form of Matthaean quotations and proposes that the allusive nature of the Gospels' citation of Dan. 7.13 is because of its occurrence in an apocalyptic section. Yet the paraphrastic form seems to be better explained as due to Jesus' *peshering* of the text for contemporary, eschatological application. See n. 168.

157. Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, p. 54, suggests that Luke's singular may be influenced by the νεφέλη of Acts 1.9 where a parallel is drawn between Christ's ascension and return. Cf. Evans, *Saint Luke*, p. 754. See also n. 171.

158. On Matthew's allusion to Zech. 12.10-14, see, e.g., France, *Jesus and the*

An Exegesis of Luke 21.25-28

The Lukan eschatological discourse (21.5-36) begins with an introductory question (vv. 5-7) that is answered by four sign sayings: (1) false messiahs, wars, and catastrophes (vv. 8-11), (2) persecution of the church (vv. 12-19), (3) the destruction of Jerusalem (vv. 20-24), and (4) final catastrophic events and the coming of the Son of Man (vv. 25-28).[159] These sayings are followed by an assurance that the end will follow these signs (vv. 29-33) and an admonition for readiness for the coming of the Son of Man (vv. 34-36).[160] As the final sign saying, the Lukan saying on the coming of the Son of Man forecasts heavenly and earthly portents (vv. 25-26), predicts the glorious coming of the Son of Man (v. 27), and ends with a word of encouragement (v. 28).

The Heavenly and Earthly Signs (vv. 25-26). In depicting the events that precede the coming of the Son of Man, Jesus describes catastrophic, apocalyptic signs in the heavens and on the earth, signs that signal the end of the world is at hand and that the messiah is about to return (cf. 21.7, 11).[161] He frames these eschatological signs in OT language by alluding to OT passages in the prophets and in the Psalms that speak of the cosmic phenomena that accompany Yahweh's

Old Testament, p. 257; and Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, p. 53.

159. See Ellis, *Luke*, p. 241, who offers an analysis of the structure of 21.5-36 on the basis of the four sign sayings and classifies the first two as signs of the age and the final two as signs of the end. Followed by Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 753-54, who explains the time span of the signs, each of which culminates in the end, as follows: while the first two concern the period from the resurrection onwards, the third begins with the destruction of Jerusalem, and the fourth begins with the cosmic signs that conclude the first saying. He argues that this interpretation shows that there are no premonitory signs until the end.

160. Most recent scholars see the eschatological discourse as a composition of several sayings rather than as a single teaching. See, e.g., G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Second Thoughts on the Composition of Mark 13', *NTS* 29 (1983), pp. 414-20; more briefly, *idem*, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), pp. 322-24; Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1323; and Ellis, *Luke*, p. 242. Otherwise: e.g., Wenham, *Rediscovery*; and Blomberg, *Historical Reliability*, p. 143.

161. Ellis, *Luke*, p. 245, notes, (1) 'The last "sign saying" begins with the "signs from heaven" that culminate the first saying (8-11)'; and (2) 'Jesus teaches that the *parousia* will not be preceded by signs evident to the unbeliever'. Cf. 17.20-37; 21.34-35.

theophany on the day of Yahweh.[162] Even though Lk. 21.25a, 26b abbreviate the more detailed portrayal of the astronomical events of Mt. 24.29/Mk 13.24-25 which are based on Isa. 13.10 (Lk. 21.25a) and 34.4 (Lk. 21.26b), his rendering still clearly echoes the OT imagery.[163]

In phrases peculiar to Luke (vv. 25b-26a), Jesus characterizes the accompanied reactions and events on the earth in the language of certain OT passages. In v. 25b he describes the distress[164] and perplexity of the nations at the roaring and tossing of the sea which reflects Ps. 65.7 (LXX 64.8), and in v. 26a he describes the fainting of men from fear and apprehension of the coming events which reflects Isa. 13.6-8.[165]

The Coming of the Son of Man (v. 27). After these signs take place (καὶ τότε), Jesus says 'then they will see[166] the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory'. He thereby portrays his

162. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, p. 165, states that 'the description was composed of OT material... which described the coming of the Son of Man in terms of Yahweh's theophany on the Day of Yahweh'. Similarly, Beasley-Murray, *Kingdom of God*, p. 331, claims that the passage is a conflation of OT allusions to the Day of the Lord 'to underscore the nature of the parousia as a theophany'.

163. See also the similar language of Joel 2.10, 30-31 (LXX 3.3-4); 3.15 (LXX 4.15); Lk. 21.25's σημεῖα ἐν... is quite similar to Joel 2.30-31 (LXX 3.3-4)'s τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. Cf. Ezek. 32.7; Amos 8.9; Hag. 2.6, 21; Rev. 6.12-16; 4QH 3.29-39; *4 Ezra* 13.30-32; *1 En.* 80; *Ass. Mos.* 10.5; *Sib. Or.* 3.796-803. See K.H. Rengstorf, 'σημεῖον', *TDNT*, VII, pp. 200-69, on the OT and Jewish background of the cosmic signs of the end times. See, e.g., Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, pp. 156-59, 165-67, 232-34; and T.F. Glasson, 'Mark xiii. and the Greek Old Testament', *ExpTim* 68 (1958), pp. 213-15, for a study of the OT allusions in Lk. 21.25-28 pars.

164. In the NT συνοχή only appears here and in 2 Cor. 2.4. See H. Köster, 'συνοχή', *TDNT*, VII, pp. 886-87.

165. On the distress and perplexity of the nations cf. Isa. 8.22; 13.4; 24.19; on the roaring and tossing of the sea cf. Ps. 46.3 (LXX 45.4); 89.9 (LXX 88.10); Jon. 1.15; Isa. 5.30; esp. Isa. 17.12; on the fear of the people cf. Isa. 13.6-11; Ps. 65.8 (LXX 64.9). For a defense of the authenticity of Luke's unique phrases, see, e.g., Wenham, *Rediscovery*, pp. 304-26.

166. The subject of ὄψονται is unspecified; Marshall, *Luke*, p. 775, thinks it refers to men in general. Although the motif of 'seeing' appears in Dan. 7.13, the following may be compared: Acts 1.11; Zech. 12.10 in Rev. 1.7; Jn 19.37.

parousia[167] in the language of Dan. 7.13b and makes an implicit claim to be the figure who was prophesied in Dan. 7.13-14. By *peshering*[168] Dan. 7.13 he transforms Daniel's anarthrous ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου[169] to the messianic title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου,[170] which he uses so frequently of himself in the Gospels.

The Son of Man's 'coming in a cloud with power and great glory'[171] is like the OT theophanies in which God came to earth on/with clouds.[172] Therefore, this coming depicts Christ as a supernatural

167. *Pace* France, *Jesus and the Old Tetsament*, pp. 227-35 (and the works cited), who argues that the coming of the Son of Man saying does not refer to the parousia but to the fall of Jerusalem in AD 70 and that the cosmic language is symbolic of political disasters. Cf. Caird, *Luke*, p. 232. For a detailed refutation of this view, see Casey, *Son of Man*, pp. 172-76; and Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Future*, pp. 167-71. Although in the OT and Jewish literature, cosmic, apocalyptic language sometimes was used figuratively of political distress, Jesus' employment here refers to the cosmic phenomena accompanying his parousia. See, e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1350; Grundmann, *Evangelium nach Lukas*, pp. 384-85; Ellis, *Luke*, p. 245; and Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 776-77.

168. *Peshering* is a type of implicit midrash in which the biblical text was altered for exegetical purposes to show an 'eschatological' fulfillment of the OT. This practice was especially prevalent in the DSS and some NT citations. For examples from the Qumran scrolls see the section on implicit midrash in Chapter 2 above, and for examples from the NT, see Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 95-96, cf. 69-70.

169. 'Son of man' is always anarthrous in the OT.

170. Dunn, *Christology*, p. 87, observes that the earliest interpretation of Dan. 7.13 for a particular individual originated with Jesus or the early church.

171. While Luke has the singular 'cloud', Matthew and Mark have the plural 'clouds' like Dan. 7.13. Bock, *Proclamation*, p. 135, like many scholars, sees Luke's singular 'cloud' linking the parousia to the transfiguration which foreshadowed Jesus in glory (Lk. 9.34-35) and to the ascension which foreshadowed his glorious return (Acts 1.9, 11). Marshall, *Luke*, p. 776, believes (1) that the singular is more indicative of the divine presence or the glory of God, and (2) that it suggests the Son of Man was accompanied by the glory of God.

172. J.E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC; Dallas: Word Books, 1987), p. 167, says that Dan. 7.13's description of 'one like a son of man, coming with the clouds of the heavens... compares with the coming of God to earth in, e.g., Isa 19.1; Ps 18.10-13 [9-12]'. Similarly, L. Sabourin, 'The Biblical Cloud', *BTB* 4 (1974), pp. 290-311, writes, 'In connection with Dn 7.13 it is observed that the coming with clouds is an exclusively divine attribute' (p. 304). Cf., e.g., Exod. 13.21-22; 19.9, 16; 34.5; Num. 10.34; 11.25; Pss. 97.2; 104.3; Ezek. 1.4-6. For the early Jewish messianic interpretations of Dan. 7.13, see France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 179-88;

figure like Yahweh who will return to earth at his parousia in the same manner that Yahweh appeared to individuals in the OT.[173] Although this saying only depicts his coming in the sky 'in a cloud' rather than specifying its origin, destination or point in time, it clearly refers to the glorious parousia of the risen and exalted Christ as the Son of Man who comes from heaven to earth for judgment and redemption.

A Concluding Exhortation (v. 28). The disciples[174] are given a word of encouragement by Jesus in closing this teaching on his parousia. When they see these[175] eschatological events occurring before the parousia, they are to take heart with joyful anticipation rather than sharing in the fear and apprehension of the lost at the cosmic signs (21.26). They are to be encouraged because their redemption is near, a redemption involving deliverance from the afflictions and persecutions of discipleship and the consummation of their salvation.[176] Although Luke does not explicitly mention the gathering of the elect as does the final saying of Mt. 24.31/Mk 13.27 (cf. 1 Thess. 4.17), it is implied in this promise of redemption.

A Midrashic Pattern

This pericope does not conform to the common *proem, yelammedenu* or similar midrashic patterns seen in the passages above. However,

and Str–B, I, pp. 956-59. Also see, e.g., *b. Sanh.* 96, 98; *Targ.* on 1 Chron. 3.24.

173. Gundry, *Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel*, p. 231, thinks that Jesus understood Dan. 7.13 to refer to 'a Messianic or eschatological figure of superhuman proportions'. Followed by Bock, *Proclamation*, p. 136, who thinks Dan. 7.13 refers to a supernatural figure. Similarly, Beasley-Murray, *Commentary*, p. 89, comments, 'The clouds of his parousia unveil his hitherto hidden glory, which is the glory of God, the Shekinah; he is seen to be the eternal Son of God, sharing in the majesty and power of God'.

174. Plummer, *Luke*, p. 485, rightly states that the disciples are regarded here as representatives of believers.

175. Although the antecedent of τούτων is not certain, it seems to refer to the cosmic signs of 21.25-26 rather than to the whole series of events or to the parousia. See Marshall, *Luke*, p. 777.

176. F. Büchsel, 'ἀπολύτρωσις', *TDNT*, IV, p. 352, says of the ἀπολύτρωσις of Lk. 21.28, 'The whole glow of eschatological expectation is in the word'. See also Marshall, *Luke*, p. 777; and Str–B, II, p. 256. Cf. Isa. 63.4; Ps. 111.9; Dan. 4.34; Rom. 8.23; Eph. 1.14; 4.30; *1 En.* 51.2-3.

L. Hartman has argued that the eschatological discourse, which includes the quotation of Dan. 7.13 at the heart of Lk. 21.25-28, is a midrash on portions of Daniel 7–12. He thinks that the midrash originated with Jesus, but he also contends that in the period between Jesus and the Gospels it was supplemented by other sayings of Jesus, was reshaped by the Evangelists, and lost many of its explicit associations with the OT. Concerning Lk. 21.25-28, he maintains that Dan. 7.13 is the key text of the entire discourse in which further OT allusions were joined together by a common theme and by key words that portray the coming of the Son of Man in terms of Yahweh's theophany on the day of Yahweh to gather his elect.[177]

Conclusions

My analysis of Lk. 21.25-28 permits the following conclusions to be drawn on Jesus' exegetical method and his resulting OT exposition on the parousia of the Son of Man.

1. In this passage Jesus used two exegetical techniques common to first-century Judaism to give a brief exposition on his parousia. (a) He gathered several OT allusions on the basis of a common theme and key words to depict his parousia and the cosmic events preceding it in terms of the coming of Yahweh on the day of Yahweh. (b) By his *peshering* of Dan. 7.13 he produced an interpretive rendering of the verse that transformed Daniel's descriptive ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου to the messianic title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου for a claim of an eschatological fulfillment of the verse in himself.

2. He expounded the OT in a prophetic manner. He used Dan. 7.13 to identify himself as the coming Son of Man and to prophesy his return as the risen and exalted Christ who will come for judgment and redemption.[178]

177. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, pp. 157-59, 165-67 (on Lk. 21.25-28 pars.), pp. 226-35 (on Lk. 21.5-36), pp. 235-48 (on a summary of the entire midrash). Followed by Ellis, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old', p. 154; *idem*, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 67 n. 93, 96 n. 69, 103 n. 99, who refers to the passage as an implicit midrash, resulting from an exposition of Dan. 7–12 that has been partly dissipated in transmission. On the likelihood of certain explicit midrashim in the NT becoming implicit (or detached) through the transmission process see *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, pp. 100-101.

178. See Bock, *Proclamation*, p. 136. Cf. Hooker, *Son of Man*, pp. 148-49, who classifies the whole eschatological discourse as prophetic rather than apocalyptic in genre.

3. Through the use of the Son of Man title, *peshering* of Dan. 7.13,[179] and OT allusions to the Yahweh theophanies, he made another of his implicit, veiled claims to deity. In this implicit claim to deity he employed the OT quotation and allusions to proclaim his coming not merely as a man or divine figure but as Yahweh on the eschatological day of Yahweh. That is, he claimed that he, the Son of Man, was in some sense Yahweh himself manifested in the person of the messiah, and that he would return at his parousia to do the work of Yahweh by inaugurating the eschaton. Even though this and other implicit claims to deity were not fully realized by his audience at the time he gave them, they certainly became apparent to his followers after his resurrection and will be apparent to all at his parousia.

179. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 137-38, argues that Dan. 7.13 was the source of Jesus' title the Son of Man, but current Judaism did not see the Son of Man as the title of the figure in Dan. 7.13 nor recognize the Son of Man as a title for the messiah. This allowed Jesus to adopt the title for his reinterpretation of his messiahship, to use it with a wider range of meaning than the original context of Dan. 7, and to express whatever he knew from the OT to be his work and fate. Otherwise: e.g., Casey, *Son of Man*, pp. 201-19, alleges that all the instances of Dan. 7.13 in the Gospels are creations of the early church and consequently rejects the view that Dan. 7.13 was the source of the title for Jesus.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS

'Jesus lived in the Old Testament'.[1] He expounded Scripture as the basis for his own understanding of his person and ministry, for teaching his followers and inquirers, and for debating with his religious opponents. In teaching his various Jewish audiences and in debating with the establishment theologians, he employed many of the exegetical methods commonly used by the religious teachers of Judaism. Yet he frequently offered interpretations of Scripture that were radically different from the other teachers of his day because of his superior understanding of Scripture and because of his application of the Old Testament to himself. As a prophetic teacher with innovative interpretations, he expounded the OT with an authority that impressed even his religious opponents, the trained Bible teachers of his day (e.g., Lk. 20.39), and he taught that the OT had its eschatological fulfillment in him (e.g., Lk. 4.21).[2] In turn, he influenced his pre-resurrection followers and the early church in their exposition of Scripture in considerable measure.

Since conclusions have been drawn after the examination of each of the eight expository episodes in Chapters 3 and 4, this final section will merely summarize the results of this study as a whole.

1. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, I, p. 205. Cf. Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 138, who writes, 'The exposition of received Scripture is, then, the sum and substance of Jesus' message, both in teaching his followers and in debating his opponents'.

2. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, p. 95, stresses that the same exegetical methods were employed but that Jesus differed from the rabbis at the point of his present application of the biblical text to himself. Cf. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, pp. 172-226, who has a chapter on the originality and influence of Jesus' use of the OT in which he shows that Jesus' interpretations differed from Judaism at the point of application to himself.

The Text Form of the Quotations

The twelve Lukan expository citations display a variety of text forms that are summarized in Table 4 below.[3] Five of the citations agree with both the LXX and the Hebrew text although they often quote only a portion of a verse (4.4, 10-11, 12; 20.17, 42-43); yet one of these has a minor agreement with the LXX against the Hebrew (4.12). The remaining seven differ from both OT versions for various reasons. Although certain variations may be attributable to such factors as a loose citation, translation, a reliance on other versions, the transmission of the traditions or incorporation into the Gospels,[4] two quotations seem to vary because of catechetical usage (10.27; 18.20), and the other five seem to have been altered for exegetical purposes (4.8, 18-19; 20.28, 37; 21.27).

The LXX text form of Jesus' OT quotations does not force one to hold to a church creation of them as argued by many scholars because the LXX is generally an accurate translation of the MT and because Jesus could have made his argument with either text. Also, the LXX text form of certain citations may be accounted for by (1) an assimilation to the LXX by the Gospel traditioners or the Evangelists, (2) a quotation of a Semitic original underlying the LXX, or (3) an original quotation in Greek.

Table 4. *The Text Form of Expository Quotations in Luke*

Lk. 4.4/Deut. 8.3	in agreement with the LXX and the Hebrew
Lk. 4.8/Deut. 6.13	in variance with the LXX and Hebrew, because of a midrashic insertion and a midrashic change of a word
Lk. 4.10-11/Ps. 91.11-12	in agreement with the LXX and the Hebrew (Satan)
Lk. 4.12/Deut. 6.16	in agreement with the LXX against the Hebrew, a difference in verb number only

3. Nine of the twelve citations are by Jesus; the other three are by those in exegetical discussions with him (Satan in 4.10-11; a lawyer in 10.27; and some Sadducees in 20.28). If the quotation is not by Jesus, the speaker is indicated in a parenthetical reference in Table 4.

4. When quotations in the double or triple tradition are compared, minor variations sometimes occur in such elements as length (e.g., Lk. 4.4 par.), word order (e.g., Lk. 18.20 pars.), and amount of paraphrase (e.g., 20.37 pars.). For a comparison of the Lukan citations with the Synoptic parallels, see the sections on the text form of the quotations in Chapters 3 and 4.

Lk. 4.18-19/Isa. 61.1-2	a mixed text form with points of agreement and variance with the LXX and the Hebrew, particularly because of a conflation of texts
Lk. 10.27/Deut. 6.5; Lev. 19.18	in variance with the LXX and the Hebrew at Deut. 6.5 but in agreement with them at Lev. 19.18; Deut. 6.5 varies because of catechetical usage (lawyer)
Lk. 18.20/Exod. 20.12-16 = Deut. 5.16-20	a mixed text form with points of agreement and variance with the LXX and the Hebrew, because of catechetical usage
Lk. 20.17/Ps. 118.22	in agreement with the LXX and the Hebrew
Lk. 20.28/Deut. 25.5; Gen. 38.8	in variance with the LXX and the Hebrew, because of a paraphrase and conflation (Sadducees)
Lk. 20.37/Exod. 3.6	in variance with the LXX and the Hebrew, particularly because of a conflation of texts
Lk. 20.42-43/Ps. 110.1	in agreement with the LXX and the Hebrew except for an article
Lk. 21.27/Dan. 7.13	in variance with the LXX and the Hebrew, because of a *peshering* of the text

The Use of Exegetical Methods

In the Lukan OT expositions Jesus used a variety of first-century Jewish exegetical formulas, terminology, methods and patterns. In all of his Lukan expositions except 21.25-28, he used formulas to introduce his OT citations.[5] And he employed other exegetical terminology in three expositions, such as *pesher*-like formulas (4.21; 20.17) and the exegetical term 'but' (20.17, 37, 38).

Jesus applied two of Hillel's exegetical rules: the *gezerah shawah*, the joining of texts by a common term (4.18-19; 20.17-18; cf. 21.25-28)[6] and *bin 'ab mikatub 'ehad*, a general principle established from one verse (20.37-38). And he employed several other exegetical methods and arguments: interpretive (i.e., *peshered*) renderings of

5. The IF are spoken by Jesus (4.4, 8, 12; 10.26; 18.20; 20.17, 37, 42 although 4.17 is in narrative form preceding an OT citation by Jesus), and they are employed by Satan (4.10) and by some Sadducees (20.28) in their expository debates with Jesus. These formulas include implicit instances of the exegetical formula 'have you not read?' by Jesus (4.16, 21; 10.26). See the discussion of Lukan IF in Chapter 2 and the list of the IF in Appendix C.

6. The lawyer of Lk. 10.27 also joined Deut. 6.5 and Lev. 19.18 by *gezerah shawah* as Jesus did in Mt. 22.37-39/Mk 12.29-31. And the Sadducees of Lk. 20.28 similarly conflated Deut. 25.5 and Gen. 38.8 but in a looser paraphrastic rendering.

verses (4.18-19; 21.27), a word play (20.9-18), allegorical parables (10.30-35; 20.9-18), an argument like that of the rabbis that hung on the strength of a single word in the biblical text (20.37-38), and a type of rabbinic, haggadic question in which two passages that appear to be in contradiction to each other are shown to be right in their own contexts (20.41-44).

All the expositions considered have literary forms that are similar to rabbinic commentary patterns: (1) the *proem*-like midrash (4.16-30; 20.9-19), (2) the *yelammedenu*-like midrash (10.25-37; 18.18-30; 20.27-40, 41-44), and (3) a rabbinic Scripture debate pattern (4.1-13). (4) Although a specific pattern is less apparent in 21.25-28, it has been analyzed as a portion of an abbreviated midrash on Daniel 7–12 in Lk. 21.5-36 that revolves around the citation of Dan. 7.13 in Lk. 21.27.

The exegetical methods and commentary patterns attributed to Jesus in Luke are sometimes less stylized, somewhat abbreviated or slightly altered when compared to those of the rabbis;[7] yet they are still quite apparent. As the common techniques and patterns of Jewish exposition of his day, they were crucial to Jesus' teaching for at least two reasons. (1) They provided a familiar method for teaching his audiences in expository settings, such as the synagogues and the temple. (2) The commentary patterns could be easily summarized for the memorization and transmission of his teachings by his disciples during his ministry (e.g., Lk. 9–10) and after his death.[8]

The Use and Exposition of Scripture

Jesus' expositions in Luke may be broadly classified in two categories: expositions on Christology and on various doctrinal issues. (1) In his christological expositions, he made an eschatological application of certain biblical texts to himself, thereby claiming to be the eschatological fulfillment of the OT messianic prophecies. (2) In his doctrinal

7. As noted above, certain changes should be expected due to such factors as (1) the earlier stage in the development of the art, (2) different theological emphases, (3) an adaptation of the method by Jesus for his situation, and (4) abbreviations involved in the transmission and other possible alterations of the tradition before their incorporation in the Gospels.

8. See Ellis, *Old Testament in Early Christianity*, p. 134, for a discussion of these points and related factors.

expositions, he challenged and corrected traditional Jewish interpretation, thereby claiming a superior exegesis of Scripture.

The Lukan christological expositions employed a *pesher* fulfillment motif[9] and several midrashic techniques to show that the OT found its typological and prophetic fulfillment in Jesus; they are summarized in various commentary patterns. The Lukan doctrinal expositions used a variety of midrashic techniques to explain Scripture for doctrine and to apply it for present conduct; they are summarized in *yelammedenu*-like patterns. These expositions are depicted in Table 5 below.

Table 5. *The Use and Exposition of Scripture by Jesus in Luke*

4.1-13	Typological for Christology: the tested, faithful and messianic Son of God
4.16-30	Typological and prophetic for Christology: the servant-messiah and the final eschatological prophet
10.25-37	Doctrinal on ethics: the identity and love of a neighbor
18.18-30	Doctrinal on soteriology: entering the kingdom of God and discipleship within it
20.9-19	Typological and prophetic for Christology: the rejected but exalted and judging messianic Son of God
20.27-40	Doctrinal on the resurrection of the dead
20.41-44	Prophetic for Christology: the Davidic messiah and the Lord
21.25-28	Prophetic for Christology: the parousia of the divine Son of Man

The Influence on the Early Church

As the founder of the NT church and earthly teacher of many of its early leaders, one would expect that Jesus' expositions of Scripture would have formed the basis of their teachings and would have influenced their exegetical methods and their choice of biblical texts. As C.H. Dodd aptly stated, 'the New Testament itself avers itself that it was Jesus Christ Himself who first directed the minds of His followers to certain parts of the scriptures as those in which they might find illumination upon the meaning of His mission and destiny'.[10]

9. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 70-75, 211-13, calls *pesher* exegesis a '"this is that" fulfillment motif'. He claims that *pesher* exegesis is Jesus' most characteristic use of Scripture and that in the NT only Jesus and his immediate followers employed it.

10. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, p. 110. He cites the Lord of Ps. 110.1, the Son of Man of Dan. 7.13, and the Servant of the Lord of Isa. 52.13-53.12 as

First, Jesus' christological use of the OT in Luke most likely provided the impetus for the church's citation of the same texts in their preaching and teaching. (1) The use and grouping of stone testimonies in Lk. 20.9-19 should be compared with Acts 4.11, Rom. 9.32-33, Eph. 2.20 and 1 Pet. 2.4-8. (2) The exposition of Ps. 110.1 and the κύριος title of Lk. 20.41-44 should be compared with Acts 2.34-35 and Heb. 1.13. (3) The quotation of Dan. 7.13 in Lk. 21.27 should be compared with Rev. 1.7, 13 and 14.14. (4) The exposition of Isa. 61.1-2 in Lk. 4.18-19 should be compared with the references to Jesus' anointing in Acts 4.27 and 10.38.

Secondly, Jesus' doctrinal use of certain texts in Luke may have influenced the church's similar application of them. (1) The argument for the resurrection from Exod. 3.6 in Lk. 20.37-38 should be compared with the description of Jesus' resurrection by the patriarchal covenant formula in Acts 3.13. (2) The exposition of Lev. 19.18 in Lk. 10.25-37 should be compared with the citation of it in Rom. 13.9, Gal. 5.14 and Jas. 2.8. (3) The quotation from the second table of the decalogue in Lk. 18.20 and elsewhere may have had some influence on the citation of portions of it in Rom. 13.9, Eph. 6.2 and Jas. 2.11.

On the basis of the studies discussed above that argue that Jesus' pre-resurrection apostles carefully preserved and transmitted his teachings,[11] and of the examination of the scriptural expositions in the present study, I conclude that Jesus' biblical expositions and his choice of biblical texts furnished the foundation for the theology of the New Testament, and that Jesus' exegetical methods influenced the exegetical procedures of his followers and the NT writers.[12]

The Unity and Historicity of Jesus' Expositions

My analysis of the Lukan versions of Jesus' expositions in light of first-century Jewish exegetical methods has presented evidence for the unity and for the historicity of the Lukan expository pericopes that

examples of OT figures fused by the creative mind of Jesus. See also, e.g., Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, pp. 206-209, and the works cited.

11. These works are cited and summarized in the section in Chapter 1 on the pre-resurrection origin of the OT expositions ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels.

12. Similarly, see E.E. Ellis, 'Jesus' Use of the Old Testament and the Genesis of New Testament Theology', *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 3 (1993), pp. 59-75.

confirm and strengthen the arguments of others, often on the basis of our examination of midrashic techniques and patterns present in the narratives.

The expositions of 4.16-30, 10.25-37 and 18.18-30 are often thought to be composed of two or more incidents or even of a series of isolated sayings that were fused together redactionally by the Evangelists or traditioners. Similarly, other passages (e.g., 20.9-19) are sometimes thought to have had the OT quotations and allusions added by the Evangelists. Yet because these pericopes conform to the *proem*, *yelammedenu* and similar literary patterns, and possess catchwords that link the parts of the discussion together and the texts to the narrative and to each other, they most likely were given and transmitted as set pieces of exposition from the beginning.

The pre-resurrection origin of almost all of Jesus' OT citations and expositions is questioned by classical form critics. The historicity of the OT quotations and expositions ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels was defended in Chapter 1 by an analysis of the historical concerns and careful transmission of the Gospel tradition and by a critique of the presuppositions and Methods of classical form criticism. Then the historical authenticity of each of the eight Lukan expository episodes attributed to Jesus was briefly defended in Chapters 3 and 4, answering the major objections of those skeptical that Jesus expounded the Scriptures and often presenting evidence for their historicity based on the midrashic elements that appear in the pericopes.

It is certain that as a prophetic teacher addressing a Jewish audience Jesus would have been required to establish his innovative teachings exegetically from Scripture and to use the commentary techniques and patterns of interpretation of his day. Therefore, he taught his disciples and various audiences, and debated with the religious leaders in the synagogues and other contexts by expounding Scripture according to the accepted methodology. In light of such a Jewish milieu that meticulously preserved the religious tradition of authoritative teachers and that required religious teachers to base their teachings on biblical exegesis, the biblical expositions like those considered in Chapters 3 and 4 have a *Sitz im Leben Jesu* and should be considered as a form in which the teachings of the earthly Jesus were transmitted from the beginning.

Appendix A

OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN LUKE*

Luke	*OT*	*Synoptic Parallels*	*Speaker*
1.15	*Lev. 10.9*	—	*Angel*
2.23	Exod. 13.2, 12, 15	—	Luke
2.24	Lev. 12.8	—	Luke
3.4-6	Isa. 40.3-5	Mt. 3.3 = Mk 1.3	Luke
4.4	Deut. 8.3	Mt. 4.4	Jesus
4.8	Deut. 6.13	Mt. 4.10	Jesus
4.10-11	Ps. 91.11-12	Mt. 4.6	Satan
4.12	Deut. 6.16	Mt. 4.7	Jesus
4.18-19	Isa. 61.1-2; 58.6	—	Jesus
7.22	*Isa. 35.5-6*	*Mt. 11.5*	*Jesus*
7.27	Mal 3.1	Mt. 11.10 = Mk 1.2	Jesus
8.10	**Isa. 6.9**	**Mt. 13.14-15 = Mk 4.12**	**Jesus**
9.54	*2 Kgs 1.10, 12*	—	*James, John*
10.27	Deut. 6.5 Lev. 19.18	Mt. 22.37-39 = Mk 12.29-31	Lawyer
12.35	*Exod. 12.11*	—	*Jesus*
12.53	*Mic. 7.6*	*Mt. 10.35-36*	*Jesus*
13.19	*Ps. 104.12*	*Mt. 13.32 = Mk 4.32*	*Jesus*
13.27	*Ps. 6.9*	*Mt. 7.23*	*Jesus*
13.35	Ps. 118.26	Mt. 23.39	Jesus
18.20	Exod. 20.12-16 = Deut. 5.16-20	Mt. 19.18-19 = Mk 10.19	Jesus
19.38	Ps. 118.26	Mt. 21.9 = Mk 11.9-10	Crowd
19.46	Isa. 56.7; Jer. 7.11	Mt. 21.13 = Mk 11.17	Jesus
20.17	Ps. 118.22	Mt. 21.42 = Mk 12.10-11	Jesus
20.28	Deut. 25.5; Gen 38.8	Mt. 22.24 = Mk 12.19	Sadducees
20.37	Exod. 3.6	Mt. 22.32 = Mk 12.26	Jesus
20.42-43	Ps. 110.1	Mt. 22.44 = Mk 12.36	Jesus

* References in standard font are classified as quotations in UBS3 and in NA26; italics: only in NA26; bold: only in UBS3.

Luke	*OT*	*Synoptic Parallels*	*Speaker*
21.26	*Isa. 34.4*	*Mt. 24.29 = Mk 13.25*	*Jesus*
21.27	Dan. 7.13	Mt. 24.30 = Mk 13.26	Jesus
22.37	Isa. 53.12	—	Jesus
22.69	**Ps. 110.1**	**Mt. 26.64 = Mk 14.62**	**Jesus**
23.30	Hos. 10.8	—	Jesus
23.34	*Ps. 22.19*	*Mt. 27.35 = Mk 15.24*	*Jesus*
23.46	Ps. 31.5	—	Jesus

Appendix B

OLD TESTAMENT ALLUSIONS IN LUKE*

Luke	*OT*	*Luke*	*OT*
1.5	Exod. 6.23	1.30	Gen. 6.8
	1 Chron. 24.10		Exod. 33.16
	Neh. 12.4		Prov. 12.2
	Neh. 12.17	1.31	Gen. 16.11
1.6	Gen. 26.5		Judg. 13.3
	Deut. 4.40		Isa. 7.14
	Ezek. 36.37	1.32	Isa. 9.6
1.7	Gen. 18.11	1.32-33	2 Sam. 7.12-13
1.9	Exod. 30.7-8		2 Sam. 7.16
1.10	Dan. 9.21	1.33	Dan. 7.14
1.11	Judg. 6.12		Mic. 4.7
	Lam. 4.20	1.35	Isa. 4.3
1.12-13	Judg. 13.6-7	1.37	Gen. 18.14
1.13	Gen. 17.19	1.41	Gen. 25.22
	Dan. 10.12	1.42	Deut. 28.4
1.15	Lev. 10.9		Judg. 5.24
	Num. 6.3	1.43	2 Sam. 24.21
	1 Sam. 1.11	1.46	Ps. 34.3-4
1.17	Mal. 3.1		Ps. 35.9
	Mal. 3.23	1.46-55	1 Sam. 2.1-10
1.18	Gen. 15.8	1.47	Isa. 17.10
	Gen. 17.17		Isa. 61.10
	Gen. 18.11		Hab. 3.18
1.19	Dan. 8.16	1.48	Gen. 29.32
	Dan. 9.21		Gen. 30.13
1.22	Dan. 10.7		1 Sam. 1.11
1.25	Gen. 30.23		1 Sam. 9.16
1.28	Judg. 6.12		Ps. 72.17

* This appendix is based on the NA26 appendix of OT references in the NT which includes allusions and quotations. See Table 1 in Chapter 2's section on OT quotations and allusions for a tabulation of the total allusions in each OT book.

Luke	*OT*	*Luke*	*OT*
	Mal. 3.12		Ps. 18.18
1.49	Deut. 10.21		Ps. 106.10
	Ps. 45.4	1.72	Exod. 2.24
	Ps. 45.6		Lev. 26.42
	Ps. 71.19		Ps. 105.8-9
	Ps. 111.9		Ps. 106.45
1.50	Ps. 89.2	1.72-73	Mic. 7.20
	Ps. 100.5	1.73	Gen. 26.3
	Ps. 103.11		Jer. 11.5
	Ps. 103.13	1.74	Ps. 97.10
	Ps. 103.17		Mic. 4.10
1.51	Ps. 89.11	1.76	Isa. 40.3
	Ps. 118.15-16	1.78	Isa. 60.1-2
	Prov. 3.34		Jer. 23.5
1.52	Job 12.19		Zech. 3.8
	Ezek. 21.31		Zech. 6.12
1.53	Job 22.9	1.79	Ps. 107.10
	Ps. 107.9		Ps. 107.14
1.54	Ps. 98.3		Isa. 9.1
	Isa. 41.8-9		Isa. 42.7
1.55	2 Sam. 22.51		Isa. 59.8
	Mic. 7.20	1.80	Judg. 13.24-25
1.58	Gen. 19.19	2.6	Gen. 25.24
1.59	Gen. 17.12	2.12	1 Sam. 10.1
	Lev. 12.3		Isa. 38.7
1.61	Ps. 18.1	2.13	1 Kgs 22.19
1.64	Dan. 10.16		Dan. 7.10
1.68	Exod. 4.31	2.14	Ps. 51.20
	Ruth. 1.6		Isa. 57.19
	1 Kgs 1.48	2.19	Gen. 37.11
	Ps. 41.14		Dan. 7.28
	Ps. 72.18	2.22	Lev. 12.2-4
	Ps. 106.48	2.23	Exod. 12.15
	Ps. 111.9		Exod. 13.2
1.69	1 Sam. 2.1	2.24	Lev. 5.11
	1 Sam. 2.10		Lev. 12.8
	2 Sam. 22.3	2.25	Isa. 40.1
	1 Chron. 17.4		Isa. 52.9
	1 Chron. 17.24		Jer. 17.7
	Ps. 18.3	2.26	Ps. 89.49
	Ps. 132.17	2.29	Gen. 15.15
	Ezek. 29.21		Gen. 46.30
1.71	2 Sam. 22.18	2.30	Job 19.27

Luke	*OT*	*Luke*	*OT*
	Job 42.5	3.33	Gen. 29.35
	Isa. 40.5		Gen. 38.29
	Isa. 42.6		Ruth. 4.12
	Ps. 67.3	3.34	Gen. 21.2-3
	Ps. 98.2-3		Gen. 25.26
2.30-31	Isa. 52.10	3.34-35	1 Chron. 1.24-27
2.32	Isa. 42.6	3.34-36	Gen. 11.10-16
	Isa. 46.13	3.36	Gen. 5.9-32
	Isa. 49.6	3.36-38	1 Chron. 1.1-4
	Isa. 49.9	3.38	Gen. 2.7
2.34	Isa. 8.14		Gen. 4.25-26
	Dan. 11.41		Gen. 5.1-8
2.38	Isa. 52.9	4.4	Deut. 8.3
2.41	Exod. 23.14-17	4.8	Deut. 6.13
	Deut. 16.16		Deut. 10.20
2.43	Exod. 12.15	4.9	Ezek. 8.3
	Exod. 12.18	4.10-11	Ps. 91.11-12
2.52	1 Sam. 2.21	4.12	Deut. 6.16
	1 Sam. 2.26		Isa. 7.12
	Prov. 3.3-4	4.18	Isa. 58.6
3.2	Jer. 1.1	4.18-19	Isa. 61.1-2
3.4-6	Isa. 40.3-5	4.19	Lev. 25.10
3.6	Ps. 67.3	4.25	1 Kgs 17.1
	Ps. 98.3		1 Kgs 18.1
3.21	Ezek. 1.1	4.26	1 Kgs 17.9
3.22	Gen. 22.2	4.27	2 Kgs 5.14
	Ps. 2.7	4.34	Judg. 16.17
	Isa. 42.1		1 Kgs 17.18
	Isa. 44.21	5.14	Lev. 13.49
	Isa. 62.4		Lev. 14.2-4
	Jer. 31.20	5.21	Isa. 43.25
3.23	Gen. 41.46		Isa. 55.7
3.27	1 Chron. 3.19	5.37	Job 32.19
	Ezra 3.2	6.1	Deut. 23.26
	Ezra 5.2	6.4	Lev. 24.5-9
3.31	2 Sam. 5.14		1 Sam. 21.7
	1 Chron. 2.15	6.20	Isa. 61.1
	1 Chron. 3.5	6.21	Ps. 126.5-6
	1 Chron. 14.4		Isa. 61.2-3
3.32	1 Sam. 16.1		Isa. 65.18-19
	1 Sam. 16.13	6.23	2 Chron. 36.16
3.32-33	Ruth. 4.18-22	6.25	Isa. 5.22
3.32-34	1 Chron. 2.1-15		Isa. 65.13

Luke	*OT*	*Luke*	*OT*
6.26	Jer. 5.31	10.5	1 Sam. 25.5-6
	Mic. 2.11	10.7	Num. 18.31
6.33	Lev. 25.35-36	10.13	Est. 4.3
6.35	Ps. 25.8		Dan. 9.3
	Ps. 86.5		Jon. 3.5-6
7.12-16	1 Kgs 17.17-24	10.15	Isa. 14.11
	2 Kgs 4.32-37		Isa. 14.13
7.15	1 Kgs 17.23		Isa. 14.15
7.19	Ps. 118.26	10.18	Isa. 14.12
7.22	Isa. 26.19	10.19	Gen. 3.15
	Isa. 29.18		Ps. 91.13
	Isa. 35.5-6	10.20	Exod. 32.32
	Isa. 42.18		Isa. 4.3
	Isa. 61.1	10.21	Ps. 136.26
7.24	1 Kgs 14.15		Isa. 29.14
7.27	Exod. 23.20	10.27	Lev. 19.18
	Mal. 3.1		Deut. 6.5
7.30	Ps. 33.10-11		Deut. 10.12
7.39	Deut. 18.15		Jos. 22.5
7.44	Gen. 18.4	10.28	Lev. 18.5
	1 Sam. 25.41		Neh. 9.29
8.6	Jer. 17.8		Ezek. 20.21
8.10	Isa. 6.9-10	10.29	Lev. 19.16
8.28	Gen. 14.18		Lev. 19.33-34
	1 Kgs 17.18	10.34	2 Chron. 28.15
8.44	Num. 15.38-39	11.20	Exod. 8.15
8.55	1 Kgs 17.22	11.22	Isa. 49.24
9.8	Mal. 3.23-24		Isa. 53.12
9.17	2 Kgs 4.44	11.31	1 Kgs 10.1
9.22	Hos. 6.2	11.32	Jon. 3.5
9.34	Exod. 24.18	11.49	Jer. 7.25-26
9.35	Deut. 18.15	11.51	Gen. 4.8
	Isa. 42.1		Gen. 4.10
9.49	Num. 11.28		2 Chron. 24.20-22
9.53	2 Sam. 17.11		Zech. 1.1
9.54	2 Kgs 1.10	12.5	Ps. 119.120
	2 Kgs 1.12	12.7	1 Sam. 14.45
9.61	1 Kgs 19.20		2 Sam. 14.11
9.62	Gen. 19.17	12.14	Exod. 2.14
	Gen. 19.26	12.16	Ps. 49.17-19
10.1	Exod. 24.1	12.19	Eccl. 8.15
	Num. 11.16	12.20	Jer. 17.11
10.4	2 Kgs 4.29	12.21	Ps. 39.7

Luke	*OT*	*Luke*	*OT*
12.24	Job 38.41		Ezek. 21.31
	Ps. 147.9	14.13	Deut. 14.29
12.32	Isa. 41.14	14.20	Deut. 24.5
	Dan. 7.18	14.26	Deut. 33.9
	Dan. 7.27	14.28	Gen. 11.3-5
12.35	Exod. 12.11	14.32	2 Sam. 8.10
	1 Kgs 18.46		2 Sam. 11.7
12.53	Mic. 7.6		Ps. 122.6
12.54	1 Kgs 18.44	15.4	Ezek. 34.11-12
13.3	Ps. 7.13		Ezek. 34.16
	Jer. 12.17	15.5	Isa. 49.22
13.6	Ps. 80.9-17	15.13	Prov. 29.3
	Isa. 5.1-7	15.18	Exod. 10.16
	Jer. 24.2-6		Ps. 51.6
	Hos. 9.10	15.22	Gen. 41.42
	Hos. 9.16-17	15.25	Dan. 3.5
	Hab. 3.17		Dan. 3.10
13.7	Lev. 19.23-25		Dan. 3.15
13.14	Exod. 20.9-10	16.3	Isa. 22.19
	Deut. 5.13-14	16.15	1 Kgs 8.39
13.17	Isa. 45.16		1 Chron. 28.9
13.19	Ps. 104.12		Prov. 24.12
	Ezek. 17.23	16.19	Prov. 31.22
	Ezek. 31.6	17.3	Lev. 19.17
	Dan. 4.9	17.4	Ps. 119.164
	Dan. 4.18	17.10	2 Sam. 6.22
13.27	Ps. 6.9	17.12	Lev. 13.45-46
13.29	Ps. 107.3	17.14	Lev. 13.49
	Isa. 43.5		Lev. 14.2-4
	Isa. 49.12	17.15	2 Kgs 5.15
	Isa. 59.19	17.27	Gen. 6.11-13
	Mal. 1.11		Gen. 7.7
13.34	Deut. 32.11		Gen. 7.17
	Ps. 91.4		Gen. 7.21-22
	Isa. 31.5	17.28	Gen. 18.20-21
13.35	1 Kgs 9.7-8	17.29	Gen. 19.15
	Ps. 69.26		Gen. 19.24-25
	Ps. 118.26	17.31	Gen. 19.17
	Jer. 12.7		Gen. 19.26
	Jer. 22.5	18.3	Exod. 22.22
14.5	Deut. 22.4	18.7	Judg. 11.36
14.8-11	Prov. 25.6-7		Ps. 22.3
14.11	Ezek. 17.24	18.9	Ezek. 33.13

Luke	*OT*
18.13	2 Kgs 5.18
	Ps. 25.11
	Ps. 79.9
	Dan. 9.19
18.18	Deut. 14.22-23
18.20	Exod. 20.12-16
	Deut. 5.16-20
19.8	Exod. 21.37
	Num. 5.6-7
19.10	Ezek. 34.16
19.27	1 Sam. 15.33
19.30	1 Sam. 6.7
19.36	2 Kgs 9.13
19.38	Ps. 118.26
19.40	Hab. 2.11
19.41	2 Kgs 8.11
19.42	Deut. 32.28-29
19.43	Isa. 29.3
19.44	2 Sam. 17.13
	Job 10.12
	Ps. 137.9
	Jer. 6.15
	Hos. 10.14
	Hos. 14.1
	Nah. 3.10
19.46	Isa. 56.7
	Jer. 7.11
20.9	Isa. 5.1-2
20.17	Isa. 28.16
	Ps. 118.22
20.18	Isa. 8.14-15
	Dan. 2.34-35
	Dan. 2.44-45
20.28	Gen. 38.8
	Deut. 25.5
20.36	Gen. 6.2
20.37	Exod. 3.2
	Exod. 3.6
	Exod. 3.15-16
20.42-43	Ps. 110.1
21.8	Dan. 7.22
21.9	Dan. 2.28-29
	Dan. 2.45
21.10	2 Chron. 15.6
	Isa. 19.2
21.11	Isa. 19.17
	Ezek. 38.19
	Ezek. 38.22
21.22	Deut. 32.35
	Jer. 46.10
	Hos. 9.7
21.24	Gen. 34.26
	Deut. 28.64
	Ezra 9.7
	Jer. 21.7
	Ezek. 32.9
	Dan. 12.7
	Zech. 12.3
21.25	Ps. 46.4
	Ps. 65.8
	Ps. 89.10
	Isa. 24.19
	Joel 3.3-4
	Jon. 1.15
21.26	Isa. 34.4
	Joel 2.10
	Hag. 2.6
	Hag. 2.21
21.27	Dan. 7.13-14
21.33	Ps. 119.89
	Isa. 40.8
21.34	Isa. 5.11-13
21.35	Isa. 24.17
	Isa. 25.29
22.7	Exod. 12.18-20
22.10	1 Sam. 10.2-7
22.19	Exod. 12.14
	Deut. 16.3
22.20	Exod. 24.8
	Jer. 31.31
	Jer. 32.40
	Zech. 9.11
22.31	Job 1.6-8
	Amos 9.9
22.32	Ps. 51.15
22.37	Isa. 53.12

Luke	*OT*	*Luke*	*OT*
22.38	Deut. 3.26	23.46	Ps. 31.6
22.62	Isa. 22.4	23.49	Ps. 38.12
22.67	Jer. 38.15		Ps. 88.9
22.68	Dan. 7.13	23.53	Deut. 21.22-23
22.69	Ps. 110.1	23.56	Exod. 12.16
23.2	1 Kgs 18.17		Exod. 20.10
23.27	Zech. 12.10-14		Lev. 23.8
23.28	Jer. 9.19-20	24.11	Gen. 45.26
23.29	Isa. 54.1	24.19	Judg. 6.8
23.30	Hos. 10.8	24.21	Isa. 41.14
23.31	Prov. 11.31		Isa. 43.14
23.34	Ps. 22.19		Isa. 44.24
	Isa. 53.12	24.25	Deut. 18.15
23.35	Ps. 22.8-9		Ps. 22
	Isa. 42.1		Isa. 53
23.36	Ps. 69.22	24.29	Judg. 19.9
23.42	Gen. 40.14	24.31	2 Kgs 6.17
23.44	Amos 8.9	24.32	Ps. 39.4
23.45	Exod. 26.31-33	24.46	Hos. 6.2
	Amos 8.3		

Appendix C

Introductory Formulas Preceding Old Testament Quotations in Luke

2.23	καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου ὅτι
2.24	κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου
3.4	ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ λόγων Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου
4.4	γέγραπται ὅτι
4.8	γέγραπται
4.10	γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι
4.12	ὅτι εἴρηται
4.17	βιβλίον τοῦ προφήτου Ἡσαΐου... οὗ ἦν γεγραμμένον
7.27	οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται
8.10	ἵνα
10.26	ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις;
18.20	τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας
19.46	γέγραπται
20.17	τί οὖν ἐστιν τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦτο
20.28	Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν
20.37	καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐμήνυσεν ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου, ὡς λέγει
20.42	αὐτὸς γὰρ Δαυὶδ λέγει ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν
22.37	ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί

Appendix D

Introductory Formulas and Terms for Scripture Appearing without Old Testament Quotations in Luke

2.22	κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως
2.27	κατὰ τὸ εἰθισμένον τοῦ νόμου περὶ αὐτοῦ
2.39	Καὶ ὡς ἐτέλεσαν πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὸν νόμον κυρίου
4.21	ὅτι σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶν ὑμῶν
6.3	οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀνέγνωτε
11.49	ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν
16.16	Ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται
16.17	τοῦ νόμου
16.29	Μωϋσέα καὶ τοὺς προφήτας
16.31	Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν
18.31	καὶ τελεσθήσεται πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν
21.22	τοῦ πλησθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα
22.37	γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει
24.25	ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἐλάλησαν οἱ προφῆται
24.27	ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν...ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς
24.32	ὡς διήνοιγεν ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς
24.44	ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς
24.45	τὰς γραφάς
24.46	ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται

Appendix E

NON-EXPOSITORY QUOTATIONS BY JESUS IN LUKE

7.27 (Mal. 3.1)	οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται· ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.
8.10 (Isa. 6.9)	ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς, ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν.
13.35 (Ps. 118.26)	ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν. λέγω [δὲ] ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με ἕως [ἥξει ὅτε] εἴπητε· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.
19.46 (Isa. 56.7; Jer 7.11)	λέγων αὐτοῖς· γέγραπται· καὶ ἔσται ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς, ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐποιήσατε σπήλαιον λῃστῶν.
22.37 (Isa. 53.12)	λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, τό· καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη· καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει.
22.69 (Ps. 110.1)	ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν δὲ ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενος ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ.
23.30 (Hos. 10.8)	τότε ἄρξονται λέγειν τοῖς ὄρεσιν· πέσετε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ τοῖς βουνοῖς· καλύψατε ἡμᾶς·
23.46 (Ps. 31.5)	καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aland, K., *et al.* (eds.), *The Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 3rd edn, 1983).

—*Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 26th edn, 1979).

—*Synopsis of the Four Gospels* (Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 7th edn, 1984).

Albertz, R., 'Die "Antrittspredigt" Jesu im Lukasevangelium auf ihrem alttestamentlichen Hintergrund', *ZNW* 74 (1983), pp. 182-206.

Alexander, P.S., 'Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scriptures', in M.J. Mulder (ed.), *Mikra* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), pp. 217-54.

—'Midrash and the Gospels', in C.M. Tuckett (ed.), *Synoptic Studies* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), pp. 1-18.

—'Rabbinic Biography and the Biography of Jesus', in Tuckett (ed.), *Synoptic Studies*, pp. 19-50.

—'Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament', *ZNW* 74 (1983), pp. 237-46.

Amir, Y., 'Authority and Interpretation of Scripture in the Writings of Philo', in M.J. Mulder (ed.), *Mikra*, pp. 421-53.

Anderson, H., 'Broadening Horizons: The Rejection at Nazareth Pericope of Luke 4:16-30 in Light of Recent Critical Trends', *Int* 18 (1964), pp. 259-75.

Archer, G.L., and G. Chirichigno, *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1983).

Argyle, A.W., 'The Accounts of the Temptations of Jesus in Relation to the Q Hypothesis', *ExpTim* 64 (1953), p. 382.

—'Did Jesus Speak Greek?', *ExpTim* 67 (1955–56), pp. 92-93, 383.

Atkinson, B.F.C., 'The Textual Background of the Use of the Old Testament by the New', *Journal of the Transactions of the Victorian Institute* 79 (1947), pp. 39-70.

Aune, D.E., 'A Note on Jesus' Messianic Consciousness and 11QMelchizedek', *EvQ* 45 (1973), pp. 161-65.

—*Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983).

Baarlink, H., 'Ein gnädiges Jahr des Herrn—und Tage der Vergeltung', *ZNW* 73 (1982), pp. 204-20.

Bacher, W., *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1889–1905).

—*Die Proömien der alten jüdischen Homilie* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913).

Bailey, K.E., *Through Peasant Eyes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980).

—*Poet and Peasant* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976).

Bammel, E., 'Das Gleichnis von bösen Winzern (Mk 12,1-9) und das jüdischen Erbrecht', *Revue internationale des droites de l'antiquité* 3 (1959), pp. 11-17.

Barrett, C.K., *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK, rev. edn, 1966).

—'The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New', in P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), I, pp. 377-411.

—'Luke/Acts', in D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson (eds.), *It is Written* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 231-44.

Bartina, S., 'Jesús y los saduceos', *EstBíb* 21 (1962), pp. 151-60.

Baumbach, G., *Jesus von Nazareth im Lichte der jüdischen Gruppenbildung* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlag, 1971).

—'Der sadduzäische Konservativismus', in J. Maier and J. Schreiner (eds.), *Literatur und Religion des Frühjudentums* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1973), pp. 201-13.

Beasley-Murray, G.R., *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen* (London: Macmillan, 1957).

—*Jesus and the Future* (London: Macmillan, 1954).

—*Jesus and the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986).

—'Second Thoughts on the Composition of Mark 13', *NTS* 29 (1983), pp. 414-20.

Bernheim, E., *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* (n.p.: Duncker & Humblot, 1914).

Best, E., 'The Camel and the Needle's Eye (Mk 10:25)', *ExpTim* 82 (1970), pp. 83-89.

—*Following Jesus* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981).

—*The Temptation and the Passion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

Betz, O., 'The Kerygma of Luke', *Int* 22 (1968), pp. 131-46.

—*Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1960).

Billerbeck, P., 'Ein Synagogengottesdienst in Jesu Tagen', *ZNW* 55 (1964), pp. 143-61.

Binder, Hermann, 'Das Gleichnis vom barmherzigen Samariter', *TZ* 15 (1959), pp. 176-94.

Bishop, E.F.F., '"Down from Jerusalem to Jericho"', *EvQ* 35 (1963), pp. 97-102.

—'People on the Road to Jericho', *EvQ* 42 (1970), pp. 2-6.

Black, M., 'The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament', *NTS* 18 (1971), pp. 1-14.

—'The Parables as Allegory', *BJRL* 42 (1960), pp. 273-87.

—'Second Thoughts IX', *ExpTim* 77 (1965), pp. 20-23.

—'The Theological Appropriation of the Old Testament by the New Testament', *SJT* 39 (1986), pp. 1-17.

Blake, B., '"Good Master" (Mk. x.17)', *ExpTim* 43 (1931–32), pp. 334.

Blank, J., 'Die Sendung des Sohnes', in J. Gnilka (ed.), *Neues Testament und Kirche* (Freiburg: Herder, 1974), pp. 11-41.

Bligh, J., *Christian Deuteronomy (Luke 9–18)* (Langley: St Paul Publ., 1970).

Bloch, R., 'Midrash', in W.S. Green (ed.), *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* (trans. M.H. Callaway; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978), I, pp. 29-50.

—'Methodological Note for the Study of Rabbinic Literature', in W.S. Green (ed.), *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* (trans.W.S. Green and W.J. Sullivan; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978), I, pp. 51-75.

Blomberg, C.L., 'Form Criticism', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 243-50.

—'Gospels (Historical Reliability)', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 291-97.

—*The Historical Reliability of the Gospels* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1987).

—*Interpreting the Parables* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1990).
—'Interpreting the Parables of Jesus', *CBQ* 53 (1991), pp. 50-78.
—'Midrash, Chiasmus and the Outline of Luke's Central Section', in R.T. France and D. Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), III, pp. 217-59.
—'Temptation of Jesus', *ISBE*, IV, pp. 784-86.
—'Tradition and Redaction in the Parables of the Gospel of Thomas', in R.T. France and D. Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), V, pp. 177-206.
Bock, D.L., 'Elijah and Elisha', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 203-206.
—*Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987).
Bonsirven, J., *Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse paulinienne* (Paris: Beuchesne, 1939).
Borg, M.J., *Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus* (New York: Edwin Mellen, 1984).
—*Jesus: A New Vision* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987).
Borgen, P., *Bread from Heaven* (Leiden: Brill, 1965).
—'Observations on the Midrashic Character of John 6', *ZNW* 54 (1963), pp. 232-40.
—'Observations on the Targumic Character of the Prologue John', *NTS* 16 (1970), pp. 288-95.
Boring, M.E., *Sayings of the Risen Jesus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).
Bornkamm, G., 'Das Doppelgebot der Liebe', in W. Eltester (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultman* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957), pp. 85-93.
—'λικμάω', *TDNT*, IV, pp. 280-81.
Borsch, F.H., *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967).
Bovon, F., *Luke the Theologian* (trans. K. McKinney; Allison Park: Pickwick Publishing, 1987).
Bowker, J.W., 'Speeches in Acts', *NTS* 14 (1967–68), pp. 96-111.
—*The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).
Bowman, J., 'The Parable of the Good Samaritan', *ExpTim* 59 (1947–48), pp. 151-53, 248-49.
Branick, V.P., 'Source Redaction Analysis of 1 Corinthians 1–3', *JBL* 101 (1982), pp. 251-69.
Bratcher, R.G., *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament* (New York: UBS, 3rd edn, 1987).
Braude, W.G. (ed.), *Pesikta Rabbati* (2 vols; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968).
Braude, W.G., and I.J. Kapstein (eds.), *Pesikta de-Rab Kahana* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1975).
Brawley, R.L., *Luke–Acts and the Jews* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).
Brooke, G.J., 'The Biblical Texts in the Qumran Commentaries', in C.A. Evans and W.H. Stinespring (eds.), *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), pp. 85-100.
—*Exegesis at Qumran* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985).
—'Qumran Pesher', *RevQ* 10 (1981), pp. 483-503.

Brown, C., 'Historical Jesus, Quest of', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 203-206.

Brown, F., *et al.*, *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Peabody: Hendriksen, 1979).

Brown, R.E., *The Birth of the Messiah* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977).

—'Luke's Method in the Annunciation Narratives of Chapter One', in C.H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978), pp. 126-38.

—'Parable and Allegory Reconsidered', *NovT* 5 (1962), pp. 36-45.

Brown, S., *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969).

Brownlee, W.H., 'Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *BA* 14 (1951), pp. 54-76.

—'The Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan', *JJS* 7 (1956), pp. 169-86.

—*The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979).

—*The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran* (Philadelphia: SBL, 1959).

Bruce, F.F., *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959).

—'Biblical Exposition at Qumran', in France and Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives*, III, pp. 77-98.

—'The Dead Sea Scrolls and Early Christianity', *BJRL* 49 (1966), pp. 69-90.

—*The New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968).

—'New Wine in Old Wine Skins. III. The Corner Stone', *ExpTim* 84 (1973), pp. 231-35.

—'Qumran and the New Testament', *Faith and Thought* 90 (1958), pp. 92-102.

Büchsel, F., 'ἀπολύτρωσις', *TDNT*, IV, pp. 351-56.

Bultmann, R., *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. J. Marsh; New York: Harper & Row, rev. edn, 1963).

—'Is Exegesis without Presuppositions Possible?', in *Existence and Faith* (trans. S.M. Ogden; New York: World Publishing, 1960), pp. 289-96.

—*Jesus and the Word* (trans. L.P. Smith and E.H. Lantero; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958).

—*Jesus Christ and Mythology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958).

—'New Testament and Mythology', in H.W. Bartsch (ed.), *Kerygma and Myth* (trans. R.H. Fuller; London: SPCK, 1953), pp. 1-44.

—'The Significance of the Old Testament for the Christian Faith', in B.W. Anderson (ed. and trans.), *The Old Testament and the Christian Faith* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), pp. 8-35.

—'ἀφίημι κτλ.', *TDNT*, I, pp. 509-12.

Burger, C., *Jesus als Davidssohn* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970).

Burkitt, F.C., 'The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen', in P.S. Allen and J. de M. Johnson (eds.), *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908), II, pp. 321-28.

Burney, C.F., *The Poetry of Our Lord* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925).

Burrell, D.J., *The Teaching of Jesus concerning the Scriptures* (New York: American Tract Society, 1904).

Burrows, M., 'Levirate Marriage in Israel', *JBL* 59 (1940), pp. 23-33.

—'The Marriage of Boaz and Ruth', *JBL* 59 (1940), pp. 445-54.

—'The Meaning of 'SR 'MR in DSH', *VT* 2 (1952), pp. 255-60.
Cadbury, H.J., *The Making of Luke–Acts* (London: SPCK, rev. edn, 1958).
Caird, G.B., *St Luke* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963).
—'The Study of the Gospels', *ExpTim* 87 (1976), pp. 137-41.
Callan, T., 'Psalm 110:1 and the Origin of the Expectation that Jesus will Come Again', *CBQ* 44 (1982), pp. 622-36.
Calvert, D.G.A., 'An Examination of the Criteria for Distinguishing the Authentic Words of Jesus', *NTS* 18 (1972), pp. 209-18.
Cappel, L., *Critica sacra* (Paris: Cramoisy, 1650).
Carlston, C.E., *The Parables of the Triple Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).
Carrington, P., *According to Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960).
—*The Primitive Christian Calendar* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952).
Carson, D.A., 'Redaction Criticism', in D.A. Carson and J.D. Woodbridge (eds.), *Scripture and Truth* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), pp. 119-42.
Carson, D.A., and H.G.M. Williamson (eds.), *It is Written* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
Casey, M., *Son of Man* (London: SPCK, 1979).
Catchpole, D.R., 'Tradition History', in I.H.Marshall (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), pp. 165-80.
Cave, C.H., 'The Parables and the Scriptures', *NTS* 11 (1965), pp. 374-87.
—'The Sermon at Nazareth and the Beatitudes in the Light of the Synagogue Lectionary', *SE* 3 (1964), pp. 231-35.
Cerfaux, L., 'Citations scripturaires et tradition textuelle dans le Livre des Acts', in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne* (Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950), pp. 43-53.
Charlesworth, J.H., *Jesus within Judaism* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1988).
Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983–85).
Chilton, B.D., 'Announcement in Nazara', in R.T. France and D. Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), II, pp. 147-72.
—*A Galilean Rabbi and his Bible* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1984).
—*The Isaiah Targum* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987).
—'Jesus *ben* David', *JSNT* 14 (1982), pp. 88-112.
Clapton, E., *Our Lord's Quotations from the Old Testament* (London: Skeffington, 1922).
Clarke, W.K.L., 'The Use of the Septuagint in Acts', in F.J.F. Jackson and K. Lake (eds.), *The Beginnings of Christianity, Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1922), II, pp. 66-105.
Cohn-Sherbok, D.M., 'Jesus' Defense of the Resurrection of the Dead', *JSNT* 11 (1981), pp. 64-73.
Collins, J.J., 'Prophecy and Fulfillment in the Qumran Scrolls', *JETS* 30 (1987), pp. 267-78.
Colpe, C., 'ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου', *TDNT*, VIII, pp. 400-77.
Combrink, H.J.B., 'The Structure and Significance of Luke 4:16-30', *Neot* 7 (1973), pp. 27-47.
Conzelmann, H., *The Theology of St Luke* (trans. G. Buswell; London: Faber & Faber, 1960).
Cornette, A., 'Notes sur la parabole des vignerons', *Foi et Vie* 84 (1985), pp. 42-48.

Coulot, C., 'La structuration de la péricope de l'homme riche et ses différentes lectures', *RevScRel* 56 (1982), pp. 240-52.
Craigie, P.C., *The Book of Deuteronomy* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976).
Cranfield, C.E.B., 'The Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37)', *TTod* 11 (1954), pp. 368-72.
—*The Gospel according to Saint Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959).
—'Riches and the Kingdom of God', *SJT* 4 (1951), pp. 302-13.
Creed, J.M., *The Gospel according to St Luke* (London: Macmillan, 1930).
Crockett, L.C., 'Luke 4:25-27 and Jewish–Gentile Relations in Luke–Acts', *JBL* 88 (1969), pp. 177-83.
—'Luke iv.16-30 and the Jewish Lectionary Cycle', *JJS* 57 (1966), pp. 13-45.
—'The Old Testament in the Gospel of Luke; with Special Emphasis on the Interpretation of Isaiah 61.1-2' (PhD dissertation, Brown University, 1966).
Crossan, J.D., *Cliffs of Fall* (New York: Seabury Press, 1980).
—*Finding is the First Act* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979).
—'The Good Samaritan: Towards a Generic Definition of Parable', *Semeia* 2 (1974), pp. 82-112.
—*The Historical Jesus* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1991).
—'Parable, Allegory and Paradox', in D. Patte (ed.), *Semiology and Parables* (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1976), pp. 247-81.
—'Parable and Example in the Teaching of Jesus', *NTS* 18 (1972), pp. 285-307.
—'Parable and Example in the Teaching of Jesus', *Semeia* 1 (1974), pp. 63-104.
—'The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen', *JBL* 90 (1971), pp. 451-65.
—*In Parables* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1973).
—*Sayings Parallels* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).
Crossan, J.D. (ed.), 'The Good Samaritan', *Semeia* 2 (1974), pp. 1-131.
Cullmann, O., *The Christology of the New Testament* (trans. S.C. Guthrie and C.A.M. Hall; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, rev. edn, 1963).
—'The Tradition', in A.J.B. Higgins (ed.), *The Early Church* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956), pp. 57-99.
Dahl, N.A., 'The Purpose of Luke–Acts', in *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976), pp. 87-98.
—'The Story of Abraham in Luke–Acts', in *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church*, pp. 66-86.
Dana, H.E., 'Jesus' Use of the Old Testament', *Biblical Review* 16 (1931), pp. 389-99.
Danby, H., *The Mishnah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933).
Daniel, C., 'Les essénièns et l'arrière-fond historique de la parabole du Bon Samaritain', *NovT* 11 (1969), pp. 71-104.
Daube, D., 'Alexandrian Methods of Interpretation and the Rabbis', in M. Gerwig *et al.* (eds.), *Festschrift Hans Lewald* (Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1953), pp. 27-44.
—'The Earliest Structure of the Gospels', *NTS* 5 (1959), pp. 174-87.
—*The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: Athlone Press, 1956).
—'Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric', *HUCA* 22 (1949), pp. 239-64.
Davids, P.H., 'The Gospels and Jewish Tradition', in R.T. France and D. Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), I, pp. 75-99.
Davidson, R., *Typology in Scripture* (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1981).

Davies, W.D., *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964).

Davies, W.D., and D.C. Allison, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), I.

Dehandschutter, B., 'La parabole des vignerons homicides (Mc., xii,1-12) et l'Evangile selon Thomas', in M. Sabbe (ed.), *L'Evangile selon Marc* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988), pp. 203-20.

Delling, G., '"...als er uns die Schrift aufschloss"', in H. Balz and S. Schulz (eds.), *Das Wort and die Wörter* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973), pp. 75-83.

Derrett, J.D.M., 'Allegory and the Wicked Vinedressers', *JTS* 25 (1974), pp. 426-32.

—*Law in the New Testament* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970).

—'Love thy Neighbour as a Man like thyself?', *ExpTim* 83 (1971), pp. 55-56.

—*New Resolutions of Old Conundrums* (Warwickshire: Drinkwater, 1986).

—'The Parable of the Good Samaritan', in *Law in the New Testament*, pp. 208-27.

—'The Parable of the Wicked Vinedressers', in *Law in the New Testament*, pp. 286-312.

—'The Stone the Builders Rejected', *SE* 4 (1968), pp. 180-86.

Deutsch, G., 'Apikoros', *JewEnc*, I, pp. 665-66.

Dibelius, M., *From Tradition to Gospel* (trans. B.L. Woolf; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2nd edn, 1935).

Dietrich, W., '"...den Armen das Evangelium zu verkünden"', *TZ* 41 (1985), pp. 31-43.

Diezinger, W., 'Zum Liebesgebot Mk xii,28-34 und Parr', *NovT* 20 (1978), pp. 81-83.

Dittmar, W., *Vetus Testamentum in Novo* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903).

Doble, P., 'The Temptations', *ExpTim* 72 (1960), pp. 91-93.

Dodd, C.H., *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet, 1952).

—*The Parables of the Kingdom* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, rev. edn, 1961).

Doeve, J.W., *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954).

—'La rôle de la tradition orale dans la composition des évangiles synoptiques', in J. Cambier *et al.* (eds.), *La formation des évangiles* (n.p.: Desclée & Brouwer, 1957), pp. 70-84.

Downing, F.G., 'The Resurrection of the Dead', *JSNT* 15 (1982), pp. 42-50.

Dreyfus, F., 'L'argument scripturaire de Jésus en faveur de la résurrection des morts (Marc, xii,26-27)', *RB* 66 (1959), pp. 213-24.

Drury, J., 'Midrash and Gospel', *Theology* 77 (1974), pp. 291-96.

—Review of M.D. Goulder, *The Evangelist's Calendar*, *JSNT* 7 (1980), pp. 71-73.

—'The Sower, the Vineyard and the Place of Allegory in the Interpretation of Mark's Parables', *JTS* 24 (1973), pp. 367-79.

—*Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976).

Drusius, J., *Parallela sacra* (Franecker, 1594).

Dunn, J.D.G., *Christology in the Making* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980).

—'Prophetic "I"-Sayings and the Jesus Tradition', *NTS* 24 (1978), pp. 175-98.

Dupont, J., 'Apologetic Use of the Old Testament in the Speeches of Acts', in *The Salvation of the Gentiles* (trans. J.R. Keating; New York: Paulinist Press, 1979), pp. 129-59.

—'L'arrière-fond biblique du récit des tentations de Jésus', *NTS* 3 (1957), pp. 287-304.

—'L'origine du récit des tentations de Jésus au désert', *RB* 73 (1966), pp. 30-76.
—'Les tentations de Jésus dans le récit de Luc (Luc, 4,1-13)', *Sciences ecclésiastiques* 14 (1962), pp. 7-29.
—*Les tentations de Jésus au désert* (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1968).
—'The Temptations of Jesus in Luke', *TD* 14 (1966), pp. 213-17.
Edgar, S.L., 'New Testament and Rabbinic Messianic Interpretation', *NTS* 5 (1958), pp. 47-54.
—'Respect for Context in Quotations from the Old Testament', *NTS* 9 (1962), pp. 55-62.
Ehrhardt, A., 'The Disciples of Emmaus', *NTS* 10 (1964), pp. 182-201.
Elderen, B. van, 'Another Look at the Parable of the Good Samaritan', in J.I. Cook (ed.), *Saved by Hope*, pp. 109-19 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978).
Elliger, K., *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1953).
Elliger, K., *et al.* (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1983).
Ellis, E.E., 'Biblical Interpretation in the New Testament Church', in Mulder (ed.), *Mikra*, pp. 691-725.
—'Exegetical Patterns in 1 Corinthians and Romans', in *Prophecy and Hermeneutic*, pp. 213-20.
—'Jesus' Use of the Old Testament and the Genesis of New Testament Theology', *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 3 (1993), pp. 59-75.
—*The Gospel of Luke* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, rev. edn, 1974).
—'Gospels Criticism', in Stuhlmacher (ed.), *The Gospel and the Gospels*, pp. 26-52.
—'How Jesus Interpreted his Bible', *Criswell Theological Review* 3 (1989), pp. 341-51.
—'How the New Testament Uses the Old', in *Prophecy and Hermeneutic*, pp. 147-72.
—'Jesus, the Sadducees and Qumran', *NTS* 10 (1964), pp. 274-79.
—'Luke, Gospel according to', *ISBE*, III, pp. 180-86.
—'Luke xi.49-51', *ExpTim* 74 (1963), pp. 157-58.
—'The Making of Narratives in the Synoptic Gospels', in H. Wansbrough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), pp. 310-33.
—'Midrash, Targum and New Testament Quotations', in *Prophecy and Hermeneutic*, pp. 188-97.
—'Midrashic Features in the Speeches of Acts', in *Prophecy and Hermeneutic*, pp. 198-208.
—'New Directions in Form Criticism', in *Prophecy and Hermeneutic*, pp. 237-53.
—*The Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1990).
—*Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1957).
—*Prophecy and Hermeneutic* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1978).
—'Quotations in the New Testament', *ISBE*, IV, pp. 18-25.
Eltester, W., 'Israel im lukanische Werk und die Nazarethperikope', in W. Eltester (ed.), *Jesus in Nazareth* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972), pp. 76-147.
Epstein, I. (ed.), *The Babylonian Talmud* (34 vols.; London: Socino, 1935–59).
Evans, C.A., 'Authenticity Criteria in Life of Jesus Research', *Christian Scholar's Review* 19 (1989), pp. 6-31.
—'The Function of the Old Testament in the New', in S. McKnight (ed.), *Introducing New Testament Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989), pp. 163-93.
—*Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992).

—'Jesus of Nazareth', *Crux* 23 (1987), pp. 15-19.
—'The Historical Jesus and the Christian Faith', *Christian Scholar's Review* 18 (1988), pp. 48-63.
—*Life of Jesus Research* (Leiden: Brill, 1989).
—'Luke's Use of the Elijah/Elisha Narratives and the Ethics of Election', *JBL* 106 (1987), pp. 75-83.
—'Midrash', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 544-48.
—*Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation* (Peabody: Hendricksen, 1992).
—'Old Testament in the Gospels', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 579-90.
—'Typology', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 862-66.
—'On the Vineyard Parables of Isaiah 5 and Mark 12', *BZ* 28 (1984), pp. 82-86.
Evans, C.A., and W.F. Stinespring (eds.), *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).
Evans, C.F., 'The Central Section of St Luke's Gospel', in D.E. Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 37-54.
—'Goulder and the Gospels', *Theology* 82 (1979), pp. 425-32.
—*Saint Luke* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990).
Farris, S., *Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985).
Feuillet, A. 'Le récit lucanien de la tentation (Lc 4,1-13)', *Bib* 40 (1959), pp. 613-31.
Finch, R.G., *The Synagogue Lectionary and the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 1939).
Finkel, A., 'Jesus' Preaching in the Synagogue on the Sabbath (Luke 4:16-28)', *Service International de Documentation Judéo-Chrétien* 17 (1984), pp. 4-10.
—'Jesus' Sermon at Nazareth (Luke 4,16-30)', in O. Betz *et al.*, (eds.), *Abraham unser Vater* (Leiden: Brill, 1963), pp. 106-15.
—'The Pesher of Dreams and Scriptures', *RevQ* 4 (1963), pp. 357-70.
—*The Pharisees and the Teacher of Nazareth* (Leiden: Brill, 1964).
Fishbane, M., *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).
—'Inner Biblical Exegesis', in G.H. Hartman and S. Budick (eds.), *Midrash and Literature* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), pp. 19-37.
—'The Qumran Pesher and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics', in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1979), I, pp. 97-114.
—'Use, Authority and Interpretation of *Mikra* at Qumran', in Mulder (ed.), *Mikra*, pp. 339-77.
Fitzmyer, J.A., 'The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament', in *A Wandering Aramean* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979), pp. 85-113.
—*Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: Chapman, 1971).
—'"4QTestimonia" and the New Testament', *TS* 18 (1957), pp. 513-37.
—'Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11', *JBL* 86 (1967), pp. 25-41.
—*The Gospel according to Luke I–IX; X–XXIV* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981–85).
—'The Languages of Palestine in the First Century AD', *CBQ* 32 (1970), pp. 501-31.
—'The Son of David Tradition and Mt 22:41-46 and Parallels', in *Essays on the Semitic Background*, pp. 113-26.

—'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Literature and in the New Testament', *NTS* 7 (1961), pp. 297-333.

Flamming, J., 'The New Testament Use of Isaiah', *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 11 (1968), pp. 89-103.

Flender, H., *St Luke* (trans. R.H. Fuller and I. Fuller; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967).

Flusser, D., 'Blessed are the Poor in Spirit...', *IEJ* 10 (1960), pp. 1-13.

—*Die rabbinischen Gleichnisse und der Gleichniserzähler Jesus* (Bern: Lang, 1981), I.

—'Die Versuchung Jesu und ihr jüdischer Hintergrund', *Judaica* 45 (1989), pp. 110-28.

Foerster, W., 'διάβολος', *TDNT*, II, pp. 72-81.

—'σατανᾶς', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 151-63.

Fox, M.V., 'The Identification of Quotations in Biblical Literature', *ZAW* 92 (1980), pp. 416-34.

France, R.T., 'The Authenticity of the Sayings of Jesus', in C. Brown (ed.), *History, Criticism and Faith* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1976), pp. 101-43.

—*Jesus and the Old Testament* (London: Tyndale Press, 1971).

—'Jewish Historiography, Midrash and the Gospels', in France and Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives*, III, pp. 99-128.

—'Scripture, Tradition and History in the Infancy Narratives of Matthew', in France and Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives*, II, pp. 239-66.

France, R.T., D. Wenham and C.L. Blomberg (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives* (6 vols.; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980–86).

Franklin, E., *Christ the Lord* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975).

Freed, E., *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John* (Leiden: Brill, 1965).

Fridrichsen, A., *The Problem of Miracle in Primitive Christianity* (trans. R.A. Harrisville and J.S. Hanson; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972).

Friebel, K.G., 'Biblical Interpretation of the *Pesharim* of the Qumran Community', *Hebrew Studies* 22 (1981), pp. 13-24.

Fuchs, E., 'σήμερον', *TDNT*, VII, pp. 269-75.

Fuller, R.H., *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965).

—*Interpreting the Miracles* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963).

Funk, R.W., 'The Good Samaritan as Metaphor', *Semeia* 2 (1974), pp. 74-81.

—*Language, Hermeneutic and Word of God* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966).

—*Jesus as Precursor* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).

—'The Old Testament in Parable', *Encounter* 26 (1965), pp. 251-67.

—*Parables and Presence* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982).

Funk, R.W. (ed.), 'A Stucturalist Approach to the Parables', *Semeia* 1 (1974), pp. 17-235.

Funk, R.W., B.B. Scott and J.R. Butts, *The Parables of Jesus: Red Letter Edition* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1988).

Funk, R.W., and M.H. Smith, *The Gospel of Mark: Red Letter Edition* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1991).

Furness, J.M., 'Fresh Light on Luke 10:25-37', *ExpTim* 80 (1969), pp. 182.

Furnish, V.P., *The Love Command in the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972).

Gagg, R.P., 'Jesus und die Davidssohnfrage', *TZ* 7 (1951), pp. 18-30.

Gaston, L., *No Stone on Another* (Leiden: Brill, 1970).

—'Sondergut und Markusstoff in Luk. 21', *TZ* 16 (1960), pp. 161-72.
Geiger, R., *Die lukanischen Endzeitreden* (Bern: Lang, 1973).
Geldenhuys, N., *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951).
Gerhardsson, B., *The Good Samaritan—The Good Shepherd* (Lund: Gleerup, 1958).
—*The Gospel Tradition* (Lund: Gleerup, 1986).
—*Memory and Manuscript* (trans. E.J. Sharpe; Lund: Gleerup, 1961).
—*The Origins of the Gospel Traditions* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979).
—'The Path of the Gospel Tradition', in Stuhlmacher (ed.), *The Gospel and the Gospels*, pp. 75-96.
—*The Testing of God's Son* (trans. J. Toy; Lund: Gleerup, 1966).
—*Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity* (trans. E.J. Sharpe; Lund: Gleerup, 1964).
Gertner, M., 'Midrashim in the New Testament', *JSS* 7 (1962), pp. 267-92.
—'Terms of Scriptural Interpretation', *BSO(A)S* 25 (1962), pp. 1-27.
Gibson, E.C.S., 'Our Lord's Use of the Old Testament', *The Expositor* 1 (1881), pp. 292-304.
Gilbert, G.H., *Jesus and his Bible* (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1926).
—'"L" Tradition', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 431-32.
Glasson, T.F., 'Mark xiii. and the Greek Old Testament', *ExpTim* 68 (1958), pp. 213-15.
Glendenning, F.J., 'The Devil and the Temptations of our Lord according to St Luke', *Theology* 52 (1949), pp. 102-5.
Goetz, S.C., and C.L. Blomberg, 'The Burden of Proof', *JSNT* 11 (1981), pp. 39-63.
Goldberg, A., 'Versuch über die hermeneutische Präsupposition und Struktur der Petiha', *Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge* 8 (1980), pp. 1-59.
Goldingay, J.E., *Daniel* (Dallas: Word Books, 1989).
Gooding, D.W., 'On the Use of the LXX for Dating Midrashic Elements in the Targums', *JTS* 25 (1974), pp. 1-11.
Goppelt, L., *Typos* (trans. D. Madvig; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).
Gordon, J.C., 'The Parable of the Good Samaritan (St. Luke x.25-37)', *ExpTim* 56 (1945), pp. 302-304.
Gordis, R., 'Quotations as Literary Usage in Biblical, Oriental and Rabbinic Literature', *HUCA* 22 (1949), pp. 157-219.
—'Quotations in Wisdom Literature', *JQR* 30 (1939–40), pp. 123-47.
Goulder, M.D., 'The Chiastic Structure of the Lucan Journey', *SE* 2 (1964), pp. 195-202.
—*The Evangelists' Calendar* (London: SPCK, 1978).
—*Luke* (2 vols.; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).
—*Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1974).
—'On Putting Q to the Test', *NTS* 24 (1978), pp. 218-34.
Goulder, M.D., and M.L. Sanderson, 'St Luke's Genesis', *JTS* 8 (1957), pp. 12-30.
Grant, W.M., *The Bible of Jesus* (New York: Doran, 1927).
Gray, A., 'The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen', *HibJ* 19 (1920–21), pp. 42-52.
Green, J.B., S. McKnight and I.H. Marshall (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1992).
Greeven, H., 'προσκυνέω', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 758-66.

Greeven, H., and J. Flichtner, 'πλησίον', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 311-18.
Grimm, W., and O. Betz, *Jesus und das Danielbuch* (2 vols.; New York: Peter Lang, 1984–85).
Grundmann, W., 'ἀγαθός κτλ.', *TDNT*, I, pp. 10-18.
—*Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 2nd edn, 1961).
Grundmann, W., *et al.*, 'χρίω', *TDNT*, IX, pp. 493-580.
Guelich, R., 'Introduction', in Stuhlmacher (ed.), *The Gospel and the Gospels*, pp. xiii-xxviii.
Guilding, A., *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960).
Gundry, R.H., 'The Language Milieu of First-Century Palestine', *JBL* 83 (1964), pp. 404-408.
—*The Use of the Old Testament in St Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 1967).
Haenchen, E., 'Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte', *ZTK* 51 (1954), pp. 153-67.
Hahn, F., *The Titles of Jesus in Christology* (trans. H. Knight and G. Ogg; New York: World Publishing, 1963).
Hanford, W.R., 'Deutero-Isaiah and Luke–Acts', *CQR* 168 (1967), pp. 141-52.
Hanson, A.T., *The Living Utterances of God* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983).
Harris, M., *From Grave to Glory* (Grand Rapids: Academie Books, 1990).
Hartman, G.H., and S. Budick (eds.), *Midrash and Literature* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986).
Hartman, L., *Prophecy Interpreted* (trans. N. Tomkinson and J. Gray; Lund: Gleerup, 1966).
Harvey, A.E., *Jesus and the Constraints of History* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982).
Hauck, F., 'παραβολή', *TDNT*, V, pp. 744-61.
—'προφήτης', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 828-61.
Hauck, F., and W. Kasch, 'πλοῦτος κτλ.', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 318-32.
Haupt, E., *Die alttestamentlichen Citate in den vier Evangelien erörtert* (Colberg: Jancke, 1871).
Hawkins, J.C., *Horae Synopticae* (Grand Rapids: Baker, rev. edn, 1968).
Hawthorne, G.F., 'The Role of Christian Prophets in the Gospel Tradition', in G.F. Hawthorne and O. Betz (eds.), *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), pp. 119-33.
Hay, D.M., *Glory at the Right Hand* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973).
Heinemann, J., 'The Proem in the Aggadic Midrashim', in J. Heinemann and D. Noy (eds.), *Scripta Hierosolymitana* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1971), pp. 100-22.
—'The Triennial Lectionary Cycle', *JJS* 19 (1968), pp. 41-48.
Hengel, M., *Between Jesus and Paul* (trans. J. Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983).
—'Das Gleichnis von den Weingärtnern Mc 12:1-12 im Lichte der Zenonpapyri und der rabbinischen Gleichnisse', *ZNW* 59 (1968), pp. 1-39.
—*Judaism and Hellenism* (2 vols.; trans. J. Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974).
—*Property and Riches in the Early Church* (trans. J. Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974).
Higgins, A.J.B., *Jesus and the Son of Man* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964).
—'Non-Gnostic Sayings in the Gospel of Thomas', *NovT* 4 (1960), pp. 292-306.

Hill, D., 'On the Evidence for the Creative Role of Christian Prophets', *NTS* 20 (1974), pp. 262-74.
—*New Testament Prophecy* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979).
—'The Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (Luke iv 16-30)', *NovT* 13 (1971), pp. 161-80.
Holst, R., 'The Temptation of Jesus', *ExpTim* 82 (1971), pp. 343-44.
Holtz, T., *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas* (Berlin: Akadamie Verlag, 1968).
Hooker, M.D., 'Christology and Methodology', *NTS* 17 (1971), pp. 480-87.
—'On Using the Wrong Tool', *Theology* 75 (1972), pp. 570-81.
—*The Son of Man in Mark* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967).
Horgan, M.P., *Pesharim* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979).
Horsley, R.A., *Sociology and the Jesus Movement* (New York: Crossroad, 1989).
Horst, J., 'οὗς κτλ.', *TDNT*, V, pp. 543-59.
Horton, F.L., Jr, 'Formulas of Introduction in the Qumran Literature', *RevQ* 7 (1971), pp. 505-14.
—'Reflections on the Semitisms of Luke–Acts', in C.H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on Luke–Acts* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978), pp. 1-23.
Horton, R.F., 'Christ's Use of the Book of Proverbs', *The Expositor* 7 (1888), pp. 105-23.
Hughes, P.E., 'The Languages Spoken by Jesus', in R.N. Longenecker and M.C. Tenney (eds.), *New Dimensions in NTS* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), pp. 127-43.
Hultgren, A.J., 'The Double Commandment of Love in Mt 22:34-40', *CBQ* 36 (1974), pp. 373-78.
Hummel, H.D., 'The Old Testament Basis of Typological Interpretation', *BR* 9 (1964), pp. 38-50.
Hurst, L.D., 'Ethics of Jesus', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 210-22.
Hydahl, N., 'Die Versuchung auf der Zinne des Tempels (Matth 4,5-7/Luk 4,9-12)', *ST* 15 (1961), pp. 113-27.
Iersel, B.M.F. van, *'Der Sohn' in den synoptischen Jesus-worten* (Leiden: Brill, 1964).
Janzen, J.G., 'Resurrection and Hermeneutics', *JSNT* 23 (1985), pp. 43-58.
Jeremias, J., *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (trans. F.H. Cave and C.H. Cave; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969).
—*Jesus' Promise to the Nations* (trans. S.H. Hooke; Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1958).
—'λίθος', *TDNT*, IV, pp. 268-80.
—*New Testament Theology* (trans. J. Bowden; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), I.
—*The Parables of Jesus* (trans. S.H. Hooke; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, rev. edn, 1963).
—'Σαμάρεια κτλ.', *TDNT*, VII, pp. 88-94.
Jones, D., 'The Background and Character of the Lukan Psalms', *JTS* 19 (1968), pp. 19-50.
Jones, P.R., 'The Love Command in Parable', *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 6 (1979), pp. 224-42.
Johnson, F., *The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1896).

Johnson, L.T., *The Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991).
Jonge, M. de, 'The Use of the Word "Anointed" in the Time of Jesus', *NovT* 8 (1966), pp. 132-48.
Josephus, F., *The Works of Josephus* (trans. W. Whiston; Peabody: Hendriksen, 1987).
Jülicher, A., *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (2 vols.; Freiburg: Mohr, 1888–89).
Kähler, M., *Jesus und das Alte Testament* (Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1896).
Kaiser, W.C., Jr, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1985).
Käsemann, E., 'The Problem of the Historical Jesus', in *Essays on New Testament Themes* (trans. W.J. Montague; London: SCM Press, 1964), pp. 15-47.
Kasher, R., 'The Interpretation of Scripture in Rabbinic Literature', in Mulder (ed.), *Mikra*, pp. 547-94.
Kelly, H.A., 'The Devil in the Desert', *CBQ* 26 (1964), pp. 190-220.
Kermode, F., 'The Plain Sense of Things', in Hartman and Budick (eds.), *Midrash and Literature*, pp. 179-94.
Kilgallen, J.J., 'The Sadducees and the Resurrection from the Dead', *Bib* 67 (1986), pp. 478-95.
Kim, S., 'Jesus—The Son of God, the Stone, the Son of Man and the Servant', in Hawthorne and Betz (eds.), *Tradition and Interpretation*, pp. 134-48.
Kirby, V.T., 'Did S. Luke Know the Old Testament?', *ExpTim* 33 (1921–22), pp. 227-29.
Kirk, J.A., 'The Messianic Role of Jesus and the Temptation Narrative', *EvQ* 44 (1972), pp. 11-29, 91-102.
Kittel, G., 'ἔρημος κτλ.', *TDNT*, II, pp. 657-60.
Klein, W.W., 'The Sermon at Nazareth (Luke 4:14-22)', in K.W.M. Wozniak and S.J. Grenz (eds.), *Christian Freedom* (New York: University Press of America, 1986), pp. 153-72.
Kodell, J., 'Luke's Gospel in a Nutshell (Lk 4:16-30)', *BTB* 13 (1983), pp. 16-18.
Koet, B.J. *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke–Acts* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989).
—'Some Traces of a Semantic Field of Interpretation in Luke 24,13-25', *Bijdragen* 46 (1985), pp. 58-73.
—'"Today this Scripture Has Been Fulfilled in your Ears". Jesus' Explanation of Scripture in Luke 4:16-30', *Bijdragen* (1986), pp. 386-94.
Köster, H., 'συνοχή', *TDNT*, VII, pp. 886-87.
Kuhn, K.G., *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960).
—'New Light on Temptation, Sin and Flesh in the New Testament', in K. Stendahl (ed.), *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), pp. 94-113.
Kümmel, W.G., 'Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtnern (Mk 12,1-9)', in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne* (Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950), pp. 120-31.
—*Promise and Fulfilment* (trans. D.M. Barton; Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1957).
Lambrecht, J., *Once More Astonished* (New York: Crossroad, 1981).
Larkin, W.J., Jr, 'Luke's Use of the Old Testament as a Key to His Soteriology', *JETS* 20 (1977), pp. 325-35.

—'Luke's Use of the Old Testament in Luke 22–23' (PhD dissertation, University of Durham, 1974).

—'Toward a Holistic Description of Luke's Use of the Old Testament', in *Evangelical Theological Society Papers* (Portland: Theological Research Exchange Network, 1987), pp. 1-18.

Lategan, B.C., 'Tradition and Interpretation—Two Methodological Remarks', *Neot* 7 (1973), pp. 95-103.

Laurentin, R., *The Truth of Christmas* (trans. M.J. Wrenn; Petersham: St Bede's, 1986).

Leaney, A.R.C., *The Gospel according to Luke* (London: A. & C. Black, 2nd edn, 1966).

Le Déaut, R., 'Apropos a Definition of Midrash', *Int* 25 (1971), pp. 259-82.

—*The Message of the New Testament and the Aramaic Bible* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982).

—'Un phénomène spontané de l'herméneutique juive ancienne', *Bib* 52 (1971), pp. 505-25.

Légasse, S., 'Jésus a-t-il annoncé la conversion finale d'Israël?', *NTS* 10 (1964), pp. 480-87.

Le Moyne, J., *Les sadducéens* (Paris: Gabalda, 1972).

Léon-Dufour, X., 'La parabole des vignerons homicides', *Sciences ecclésiastiques* 17 (1965), pp. 365-96.

—'The Murderous Vineyard-Workers', *TD* 15 (1967), pp. 30-36.

Lieberman, S., *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950).

Lightfoot, J., *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica* (4 vols.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1859).

Lim, T.H., 'Eschatological Orientation and the Alteration of Scripture in the Habakkuk Pesher', *JNES* 49 (1990), pp. 185-94.

Lindars, B., *Jesus Son of Man* (London: SPCK, 1983).

—*New Testament Apologetic* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961).

—'The Place of the Old Testament in the Formation of New Testament Theology', *NTS* 23 (1977), pp. 59-66.

Linnemann, E., *Jesus of the Parables* (trans. J. Sturdy; New York: Harper & Row, 1966).

Liu, P., 'The Poor and the Good News' (PhD dissertation; Fuller Theological Seminary, 1986).

Loader, W.R.G., 'Christ at the Right Hand', *NTS* 24 (1978), pp. 199-217.

Loewe, R., 'The "Plain" Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis', *Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies* 1 (1964), pp. 140-85.

Lohse, E., 'Lukas als Theologe der Heilsgeschichte', *EvT* 14 (1954), pp. 256-75.

—'Der König aus Davids Geschlecht', in Betz *et al.* (eds.), *Abraham Unser Vater*, pp. 337-45.

—'ῥαββί', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 961-65.

—*Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich: Kösel Verlag, 1964).

—'υἱὸς Δαυίδ', *TDNT*, VIII, pp. 478-88.

Longenecker, R.N., *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975).

—'Literary Criteria in Life of Jesus Research', in G.F. Hawthorne (ed.), *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), pp. 217-29.

Lövestam, E., 'Die Davidssohnfrage', *SEÅ* 27 (1962), pp. 72-82.
Lowe, M., 'From the Parable of the Vineyard to a Pre-Synoptic Source', *NTS* 28 (1982), pp. 257-63.
Lowy, S., 'Some Aspects of Normative and Sectarian Interpretation of the Scriptures', *Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society* 6 (1966–68), pp. 98-163.
Lund, N.W., *Chiasmus in the New Testament* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942).
McConnell, R.S., *Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel* (Basel: Reinhardt, 1969).
McEleney, N.J., 'Authenticating Criteria and Mark 7:1-23', *CBQ 34* (1972), pp. 431-60.
MacFarland, C.S., *Jesus and the Prophets* (New York: Knickerbocker, 1905).
McKelvey, R.J., *The New Temple* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969).
McKnight, E.V., *What is Form Criticism?* (Philadelphia: Fortress: Press, 1969).
McNamara, M., 'Some Issues and Recent Writings on Judaism and the New Testament', *IBS* 9 (1987), pp. 136-49.
McNeil, B., 'Midrash in Luke?', *HeyJ* 19 (1978), pp. 399-404.
McNeile, A.H., 'Our Lord's Use of the Old Testament', in H.B. Swete (ed.), *Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day* (London: Macmillan, 1909), pp. 215-50.
Mann, J., *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1940), I.
—'Jesus and the Sadducean Priests', *JQR* 6 (1915), pp. 415-22.
Manns, F., 'Une homilie yelammedenou', in *Essais sur le Judéo Christianisme* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1977), pp. 52-60.
—'La technique du Al Tiqra dans les evangiles', *RevScRel* 64 (1990), pp. 1-7.
Manson, T.W., 'The Cleansing of the Temple', *BJRL* 33 (1950–51), pp. 271-82.
—'The Old Testament in the Teachings of Jesus', *BJRL* 34 (1951–52), pp. 312-32.
—'Sadducee and Pharisee—The Origin and the Significance of the Names', *BJRL* 22 (1938), pp. 144-59.
—*The Sayings of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957).
—*The Teaching of Jesus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2nd edn, 1963).
Marshall, I.H., *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978).
—*I Believe in the Historical Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977).
—*Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2nd edn, 1989).
—'The Son of Man in Contemporary Debate', in *Jesus the Saviour* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1990), pp. 100-20.
—'The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussion', in *Jesus the Saviour* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1990), pp. 73-99.
Marshall, I.H. (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977).
Masson, C., 'Jésus à Nazareth', in *Vers les sources d'eau vive* (Lausanne: Librairie Payot, 1961), pp. 38-69.
Masson, W.J., 'The Parable of the Good Samaritan', *ExpTim 48* (1936–37), pp. 179-82.
Mattill, A.J., Jr, 'The Good Samaritan and the Purpose of Luke-Acts', *Encounter* 33 (1972), pp. 359-76.
Mauser, U., *Christ in the Wilderness* (Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1963).
Maybaum, S., *Die ältesten Phasen in der Entwickelung der jüdischen Predigt* (Berlin: Itzkowski, 1901).

Mead, R.T., 'A Dissenting Opinion about Respect for Context in Old Testament Quotations', *NTS* 10 (1964), pp. 279-89.
Mealand, D.L., 'The Dissimilarity Test', *SJT* 31 (1978), pp. 41-50.
Meeks, W.A., '"And Rose up to Play"', *JSNT* 16 (1982), pp. 64-78.
Meier, J.P., *A Marginal Jew* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1991).
Meinhold, J., *Jesus und das Alte Testament* (Leipzig: Mohr, 1896).
Metzger, B.M., 'The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah', *JBL* 70 (1951), pp. 297-307.
—*A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York: UBS, 1971).
Meyer, B.F., *The Aims of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1979).
Meyer, R., 'Σαδδουκαῖος', *TDNT*, VII, pp. 35-54.
Michel, O., 'κάμηλος', *TDNT*, III, pp. 592-94.
Milavec, A., 'The Identity of "the Son" and "the Others" in Mark's Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen Reconsidered', *BTB* 20 (1990), pp. 30-37.
—'Mark's Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen as Reaffirming God's Predilection for Israel', *JES* 26 (1989), pp. 289-312.
Miller, M.P., 'The Function of Isaiah 61:1-2 in 11QMelchizedek', *JBL* 88 (1969), pp. 467-69.
—'Targum, Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament', *JSJ* 2 (1971), pp. 29-82.
Miller, P.D., Jr, 'An Exposition of Luke 4:16-21', *Int* 29 (1975), pp. 417-21.
Minear, P.S., 'The Needle's Eye', *JBL* 61 (1942), pp. 157-69.
Moessner, D.P., *Lord of the Banquet* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989).
—'Luke 9:1-50: Luke's Preview of the Journey of the Prophet like Moses of Deuteronomy', *JBL* 102 (1983), pp. 575-605.
Monselewski, W., *Der barmherzige Samariter* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1967).
Monshouwer, D., 'The Reading of the Prophet in the Synagogue at Nazareth', *Bib* 72 (1991), pp. 90-99.
Montefiore, H., 'A Comparison of the Gospel according to Thomas and of the Synoptic Gospels', *NTS* 7 (1961), pp. 220-48.
Moo, D.J., *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983).
Moore, G.F., *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (3 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927–30).
Moran, W.L., 'The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy', *CBQ* 25 (1963), pp. 77-87.
Morgan, G.C., *Christ and the Bible* (Clapham Park: Queensgate, n.d.).
Morris, L., *The Gospel according to Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992).
—'The Gospels and the Jewish Lectionaries', in France and Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives*, III, pp. 129-56.
—*Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, rev. edn, 1988).
—*The New Testament and the Jewish Lectionaries* (London: Tyndale Press, 1964).
Moule, C.F.D., *The Birth of the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 3rd edn, 1982).
—'Fulfillment-Words in the New Testament', *NTS* (1968), pp. 293-320.
Mulder, M.J. (ed.), *Mikra* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988).
Müller, K., 'Jesus und die Sadduzäer', in H. Merklein and J. Lang (eds.), *Biblische Randbemerkungen* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1974), pp. 3-24.

Murray, V.A., 'The Temptation of Jesus', *ExpTim* 60 (1948–49), pp. 99-101.
Murray, G., 'The Rich Young Man', *Downside Review* 103 (1985), pp. 144-46.
Neill, S., and T. Wright, *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861–1986* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd edn, 1988).
Neugebauer, F., 'Die Davidssohnfrage (Mark xii.35-37 Parr) und der Menschensohn', *NTS* 21 (1974), pp. 81-108.
—'Geistsprüche und Jesuslogien', *ZNW* 53 (1962), pp. 218-28.
Neusner, J., *The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan* (Atlanta: Scholars Press), 1986.
—*Midrash in Context* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1983).
—*What is Midrash?* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987).
Newell, J.E., and R.R. Newell, 'The Parable of the Wicked Tenants', *NovT* 14 (1972), pp. 226-37.
Nicol, W., 'Tradition and Redaction in Luke 21', *Neot* 7 (1973), pp. 61-71.
Nicole, R., 'The Old Testament in the New Testament', in F.E. Gaebelein, (ed.), *The Expositor's Bible Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979), I, pp. 617-28.
Nierynck, F., 'La matière marcienne dans l'évangile de Luc', in F. Nierynck (ed.), *L'Evangile de Luc* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1973), pp. 157-201.
Nolland, J., *Luke 1–9:20* (WBC; Dallas: Word Books, 1989).
Odeberg, H., 'Ἰακώβ', *TDNT*, III, pp. 191-92.
Oepke, A.,'ἀνίστημι κτλ.', *TDNT*, I, pp. 368-72.
—*Jesus und das Alte Testament* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1938).
Oliver, H.H., 'The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke–Acts', *NTS* 10 (1964), pp. 202-26.
O'Neill, J.C., 'The Six Amen Sayings in Luke', *JTS* 10 (1959), pp. 1-9.
—'The Source of the Parables of the Bridegroom and the Wicked Husbandmen', *JTS* 39 (1988), pp. 485-89.
Orchard, J.B., 'J.A.T. Robinson and the Synoptic Problem', *NTS* 22 (1976), pp. 346-52.
Osborne, G.R., 'Redaction Criticism', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 662-69.
Owen, H., *The Modes of Quotation Used by the Evangelical Writers* (London: J. Nichols, 1789).
Patte, D., *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975).
Perrin, N., *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967).
Perrot, C., 'Luc 4,16-30 et le lecture biblique de l'ancienne synagogue', *RevScRel* 47 (1973), pp. 324-40.
—'The Reading of the Bible in the Ancient Synagogue', in Mulder (ed.), *Mikra*, pp. 137-59.
Peters, J.P., 'Christ's Treatment of the Old Testament', *JBL* 15 (1896), pp. 87-105.
Plummer, A., *The Gospel according to S. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 5th edn, 1922).
Pokorny, P., 'The Temptation Stories and their Intention', *NTS* 20 (1974), pp. 115-27.
Polkow, D., 'Method and Criteria for Historical Jesus Research', in K.H. Richards (ed.), *SBL 1987 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), pp. 336-56.
Porton, G.G., 'Defining Midrash', in J. Neusner (ed.), *The Study of Ancient Judaism* (New York: Ktav, 1981), I, pp. 55-92.
—*Understanding Rabbinic Midrash* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1985).

Powell, W., 'The Temptation', *ExpTim* 72 (1961), p. 248.
Rabinowitz, I., 'Pesher/Pittaron', *RevQ* 8 (1973), pp. 219-32.
Rahlfs, A. (ed.), *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1979).
Ramaroson, L., 'Comme "le bon Samaritain", ne chercher qu'à aimer (Lc 10,29-37)', *Bib* 56 (1975), pp. 533-36.
Randolph, T., *The Prophecies and Other Texts Cited in the New Testament* (Oxford: Fletcher, 1782).
Reicke, B., 'Der barmherzige Samariter', in O. Böcher and K. Haacker (eds.), *Verborum Veritas* (Wuppertal: Theologischer Verlag Rolf Brockhaus, 1970), pp. 103-109.
—'Jesus in Nazareth—Lk 4,14-30', in H. Balz and S. Schulz (eds.), *Das Wort und die Wörter* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973), pp. 47-55.
—*The New Testament Era* (trans. D.E. Green; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964).
Reim, G., *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974).
Rengstorf, K.H., 'διδάσκω', *TDNT*, II, pp. 135-65.
—'λῃστής', *TDNT*, IV, pp. 257-62.
—'σημεῖον', *TDNT*, VII, pp. 200-269.
Rese, M., *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1969).
Riesenfeld, H., *The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings* (London: Mowbray, 1957).
—'The Messianic Character of the Temptation in the Wilderness', in *The Gospel Tradition* (trans. E.M. Rowley; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), pp. 75-93.
Riesner, R., *Jesus als Lehrer* (Tübingen: Mohr, 3rd edn, 1988).
—'Jüdische Elementarbildung und Evangelienüberlieferung', in France and Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives*, I, pp. 209-23.
—'Der Ursprung der Jesus-Überlieferung', *TZ* 38 (1982), pp. 493-513.
Ringe, S.H., *Jesus, Liberation and the Biblical Jubilee* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985).
—'The Jubilee Proclamation in the Ministry and Teaching of Jesus' (PhD dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1981).
Ringgren, H., 'Luke's Use of the Old Testament', *HTR* 79 (1986), pp. 227-36.
Robert, A., 'Littéraires (Genres)', *DBSup*, V, pp. 406-21.
Robinson, J.A.T., 'The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen', *NTS* 21 (1975), pp. 443-61.
—'The Temptations', *Theology* 50 (1947), pp. 43-48.
Rodgers, M., 'Luke 4:16-30—A Call for a Jubilee Year?', *RTR* 40 (1981), pp. 72-82.
Roth, C., 'The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis', *VT* 10 (1960), pp. 51-68.
Russell, D.S., *From Early Judaism to Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).
Ryle, H.E., *Philo and Holy Scripture* (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1895).
Sabourin, L., 'The Biblical Cloud', *BTB* 4 (1974), pp. 290-311.
Saldarini, A.J., 'Judaism and the New Testament', in E.J. Epp and G.W. MacRae (eds.), *The New Testament and its Modern Interpreters* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989), pp. 27-54.
Sanders, E.P., *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985).
—'Priorités et dépendances dans la tradition synoptique', *RSR* 60 (1972), pp. 519-40.

—*The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).

Sanders, J.A., 'The Ethic of Election in Luke's Great Banquet Parable', in J.L. Crenshaw and J.T. Willis (eds.), *Essays on Old Testament Ethics* (New York: Ktav, 1974), pp. 245-71.

—'From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), pp. 75-106.

—'Isaiah in Luke', *Int* 36 (1982), pp. 144-55.

—'The Old Testament in 11QMelchizedek', *JANESCU* 5 (1973), pp. 373-82.

Sanders, J.T., 'The Prophetic Use of Scriptures in Luke–Acts', in Evans and Stinespring (eds.), *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis*, pp. 191-98.

Sanders, W.E., 'A Study of the Method of Jesus in his Interpretation of the Old Testament' (ThD dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1948).

Schlatter, A., *Das Evangelium des Lukas* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 3rd edn, 1975).

Schmeichel, W., 'Christian Prophecy in Lukan Thought', in G. MacRae (ed.), *SBL 1976 Seminar Papers* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976), pp. 293-304.

Schmidt, K.L., *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (Berlin: Trowitzsch Sohn, 1919).

Schneider, G., 'Die Davidssohnfrage (Mk 12,35-37)', *Bib* 53 (1972), pp. 65-90.

Schoedel, W.R., 'Parables in the Gospel of Thomas', *CTM* 43 (1972), pp. 548-60.

Scott, B.B., *Hear then the Parable* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989).

Schramm, T., *Markus-Stoff bei Lukas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971).

Schubert, P., 'The Structure and Significance of Luke 24', in W. Eltester (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1954), pp. 165-86.

Schürer, E., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (3 vols.; rev. and ed. G. Vermes *et al.*; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979).

Schürmann, H., 'Der "Bericht vom Angang"', *SE* 2 (1964), pp. 242-55.

—*Das Lukasevangelium* (Freiburg: Herder, 1984).

—'Das Thomasevangelium und das lukanische Sondergut', *BZ* 7 (1963), pp. 236-60.

—'Zur Traditionsgeschichte der Nazareth Perikope Lk. 4:16-30', in A. Descamps and A. de Halleux (eds.), *Melanges bibliques* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1970), pp. 187-295.

—'Die vorösterlichen Anfänge der Logientradition', in *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968), pp. 39-65.

Schwankl, O., *Die Sadduzäerfrage (Mk 12,18-27 parr)* (Frankfurt: Athenäum, 1987).

—'Die Sadduzäerfrage (Mk 12,18-27) und die Auferstehungserwartung Jesu', *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 50 (1987), pp. 81-92.

Schweizer, E., *The Good News according to Luke* (trans. D.E. Green; Atlanta: John Knox, 1984).

Scroggs, R., 'Paul as Rhetorician', in R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs (eds.), *Jews, Greeks and Christians* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), pp. 271-98.

Seccombe, D., 'Luke and Isaiah', *NTS* 27 (1981), pp. 252-59.

—*Possessions and the Poor in Luke–Acts* (Linz: Fuchs, 1983).

Seesemann, H., 'πεῖρα κτλ.', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 23-36.

Seitz, O.J.F., 'The Future Coming of the Son of Man', *SE* 6 (1973), pp. 478-94.

Sellin, G., 'Lukas als Gleichniserzähler', *ZNW* 65 (1974), pp. 166-89; *ZNW* 66 (1975), pp. 19-60.

Sevenster, J.N., *Do you Know Greek?* (trans. J. De Bruin; Leiden: Brill, 1968).
Sheppard, G.T., 'More on Isaiah 5:1-7 as a Juridical Parable', *CBQ* 44 (1982), pp. 45-47.
Sigal, P., *The Halakah of Jesus of Nazareth according to the Gospel of Matthew* (New York: University Press of America, 1986).
Silberman, L.H., 'Unriddling the Riddle', *RevQ* 3 (1961), pp. 323-64.
Silva, M., 'The New Testament Use of the Old Testament', in D.A. Carson and J.D. Woodbridge (eds.), *Scripture and Truth* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), pp. 147-65.
Sloan, R.B., *The Favorable Year of the Lord* (Austin, TX: Schola Press, 1977).
Slomovic, E., 'Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls', *RevQ* 7 (1969), pp. 3-15.
Smalley, S.S., 'Redaction Criticism', in Marshall (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation*, pp. 181-95.
Smith, D.M., 'The Use of the Old Testament in the New', in J.M. Efird (ed.), *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1972), pp. 3-65.
Smith, M., 'A Comparison of Early Christian and Rabbinic Tradition', *JBL* 82 (1963), pp. 169-76.
—*Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels* (Philadelphia: SBL, 1951).
Snodgrass, K.R., 'Parable', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 591-600.
—'The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen', *NTS* 20 (1974), pp. 142-44.
—*The Parable of the Wicked Tenants* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983).
Songer, H., 'Isaiah and the New Testament', *RevExp* 65 (1968), pp. 459-70.
Sparks, H.F.D., 'The Semitisms in St Luke's Gospel', *JTS* 44 (1943), pp. 129-38.
—'The Semitisms of Acts', *JTS* 1 (1950), pp. 16-28.
—'Some Observations on the Semitic Background of the New Testament', *Society for New Testament Studies Bulletin* 2 (1951), pp. 33-42.
Spencer, F.S., '2 Chronicles 28:5-15 and the Parable of the Good Samaritan', *WTJ 46* (1984), pp. 317-49.
Spitta, F., 'Jesu Weigerung, sich als "gut" bezeichnen zu lassen', *ZNW* 9 (1908), pp. 12-20.
Stanton, G., 'Form Criticism Revisited', in M. Hooker and C. Hickling (eds.), *What about the New Testament?* (London: SCM Press, 1975), pp. 13-27.
—'The Gospel Traditions and Early Christian Reflection', in S.W. Sykes and J.P. Clayton (eds.), *Christ, Faith and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), pp. 191-204.
—*Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974).
—'Q', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 644-50.
Stegner, W.R., 'Romans 9.6-29—A Midrash', *JSNT* 22 (1984), pp. 37-52.
—'The Temptation Narrative', *BR* 35 (1990), pp. 5-17.
—'Wilderness and Testing in the Scrolls and in Matthew 4:1-11', *BR* 12 (1967), pp. 18-27.
Stein, E., 'Die homiletische Peroratio im Midrasch', *HUCA* 8–9 (1931–32), pp. 353-71.
Stein, R.H., *Luke* (New American Commentary; Nashville: Broadman Press, 1992).

—'The "Criteria" for Authenticity', in France and Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives*, I, pp. 225-63.

—*The Method and Message of Jesus' Teachings* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978).

—*The Synoptic Problem* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987).

—'Synoptic Problem', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 784-92.

Stendahl, K., *The School of St Matthew* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968).

Stern, J.B., 'Jesus' Citation of Dt 6,5 and Lv 19,18 in the Light of Jewish Tradition', *CBQ* 28 (1966), pp. 312-16.

Strack, H.L., *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1931).

Strack, H.L., and P. Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud and Midrasch* (5 vols.; Munich: Oskar Beck, 1922–56).

Strauss, D.F., *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined* (trans. G. Elliot; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972).

Strobel, A., 'Das apokalyptische Terminproblem in der sogenannte Antrittspredigt Jesus (Lk 4,16-30)', *TLZ* 92 (1967), pp. 251-54.

—'Die Ausrufung des Jubeljahres in der Nazarethpredigt Jesus', in W. Eltester (ed.), *Jesus in Nazareth* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972), pp. 38-50.

Stuhlmacher, P. (ed.), *The Gospel and the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991).

—'The Theme: The Gospel and the Gospels', in Stuhlmacher (ed.), *The Gospel and the Gospels*, pp. 1-25.

Suhl, A., 'Der Davidssohn im Matthäus-Evangelium', *ZNW* 59 (1968), pp. 57-81.

—*Der Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965).

Surenhusius, W., ספר המשנה *sive* βίβλος καταλλαγῆς (Amsterdam: Boom, 1713).

Swanston, H., 'The Lukan Temptation Narrative', *JTS* 17 (1966), pp. 71.

Swete, H.B., *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, rev. edn, 1900).

Talbert, C.H., *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke–Acts* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974).

—'Promise and Fulfillment in Lucan Theology', in C.H. Talbert (ed.), *Luke–Acts* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), pp. 91-103.

—*Reading Luke* (New York: Crossroad, 1982).

Tannehill, R.C., 'The Mission of Jesus according to Luke 4:16-30', in W. Eltester (ed.), *Jesus in Nazareth* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972), pp. 51-75.

—*The Narrative Unity of Luke–Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), I.

Tasker, R.V.G., *Our Lord's Use of the Old Testament* (Glasgow: Rickering & Inglis, 1953).

Taylor, A.B., Jr, 'Decision in the Desert', *Int* 14 (1960), pp. 300-309.

Taylor, V., *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (London: Macmillan, 2nd edn, 1935).

—*The Gospel according to Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1959).

Thomas, K.J., 'Liturgical Citations in the Synoptics', *NTS* 22 (1976), pp. 205-14.

—'Torah Citations in the Synoptics', *NTS* 24 (1977), pp. 85-96.

Thomas, R.L., 'The Rich Young Man in Matthew', *GTJ* 3 (1982), pp. 235-60.

Thompson, G.H.P., 'Called—Proved—Obedient', *JTS* 11 (1960), pp. 1-12.

Thomson, J.G.S.S., 'Christ and the Old Testament', *ExpTim* 67 (1965), pp. 18-20.
Tilden, E.E., Jr, 'The Functions of the Old Testament in the Sayings of Jesus as Recorded in the Synoptic Gospels' (PhD dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1945).
—'The Study of Jesus' Interpretive Methods', *Int* 7 (1953), pp. 45-61.
Tödt, H.E., *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. D.M. Barton; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965).
Tov, E., 'The Septuagint', in Mulder (ed.), *Mikra*, pp. 116-88.
Towner, W.S., 'Hermeneutical Systems of Hillel and the Tannaim', *HUCA* 53 (1982), pp. 101-35.
Townsend, J.T. (ed.), *Midrash Tanhuma* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1989), I.
Toy, C.H., *Quotations in the New Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884).
Travis, S.H., 'Form Criticism', in Marshall (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation*, pp. 153-64.
Trocmé, A., *Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution* (trans. M.H. Shank and M.E. Miller; Scottsdale: Herald Press, 1973).
Trudinger, L.P., 'Once Again, Now "Who is My Neighbour?"', *EvQ* 48 (1976), pp. 160-63.
Tuckett, C.M., 'Luke 4,16-30, Isaiah and Q', in J. Delobel (ed.), *Logia* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982), pp. 343-54.
—'Thomas and the Synoptics', *NovT* 30 (1988), pp. 132-57.
Turner, H.E.W., *Historicity and the Gospels* (London: Mowbray, 1963).
Turner, M.M.B., 'Jesus and the Spirit in Lucan Perspective', *TynBul* 32 (1981), pp. 3-42.
Turner, N., 'The Quality of Greek in Luke–Acts', in J.K. Elliot (ed.), *Studies in New Testament Language and Text* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), pp. 387-400.
Turpie, D.M., *The New Testament View of the Old* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1872).
—*The Old Testament in the New* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1868).
Twelftree, G.H., 'Demon, Devil, Satan', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 163-72.
—'Temptation of Jesus', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 821-27.
Unnik, W.C. van, 'Jesus the Christ', *NTS* 8 (1961), pp. 101-16.
Venard, L., 'Citations de l'ancien testaments dans le nouveau testament', *DBSup*, II, pp. 23-51.
Vermes, G., 'Bible and Midrash', in *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), pp. 59-91.
—*The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin Books, 3rd edn, 1987).
—*Jesus and the World of Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983).
—'Jewish Literature and New Testament Exegesis', *JJS* 33 (1982), pp. 361-76.
—*Post-Biblical Jewish Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1975).
—'The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in its Historical Setting', in *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies*, pp. 37-49.
—*Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1961).
Via, D.O., Jr, 'Parable and Example Story', *Semeia* 1 (1974), pp. 105-33.
—*The Parables* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967).

Vincent, J.J., 'Did Jesus Teach his Disciples to Learn by Heart?', *SE* 3 (1964), pp. 105-64.

Violet, B., 'Zum rechten Verständnis der Nazareth-Perikope Lc 4:16-30', *ZNW* 37 (1938), pp. 251-71.

Vouga, F., 'Controverse sur la resurrection des morts (Marc 12,18-27)', *Lumiere et vie* 35 (1986), pp. 49-61.

Wagner, W., 'In welchem Sinne hat Jesus das Prädikat ΑΓΑΘΟΣ von sich abgewiesen?' *ZNW* 8 (1907), pp. 143-61.

Walker, W.O., 'The Quest for the Historical Jesus', *ATR* 51 (1969), pp. 38-56.

Walter, N., 'Zur analyse von Mc 10:17-31', *ZNW* 53 (1962), pp. 206-18.

Warfield, B.B., 'Jesus' Alleged Confession of Sin', *Princeton Theological Review* 12 (1914), pp. 177-228.

Watts, J.D.W., *Isaiah 34–66* (WBC; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987).

Weiss, J., '"Zum reichen Jüngling" Mk 10,13-27', *ZNW* 11 (1910), pp. 79-83.

Wenham, D., *The Rediscovery of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984).

—'Source Criticism', in Marshall (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation*, pp. 139-52.

Wenham, J.W., *Our Lord's View of the Old Testament* (London: Tyndale, 1953).

—*Christ and the Bible* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1972).

—'Why do you Ask me about the Good?', *NTS* 28 (1982), pp. 116-28.

Westermann, C., *Isaiah 40–66* (OTL; trans. D.M.G. Walker; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969).

Wigram, G.V., *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 5th edn, 1970).

Wilcox, M., *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965).

—'Text Form', in Carson and Williamson (eds.), *It is Written*, pp. 193-204.

Wiles, M., 'Studies in Texts: Lk 20.34-36', *Theology* 60 (1957), pp. 500-502.

Wilkinson, F.H., 'Obed: Proto-Type of the Good Samaritan', *ExpTim* 69 (1957), p. 94.

Willis, J.T., 'The Genre of Isaiah 5:1-7', *JBL* 96 (1977), pp. 337-62.

Wise, W.O., 'Languages of Palestine', in Green *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, pp. 434-44.

Witherington, B., III, *The Christology of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990).

Wright, A.G., *The Literary Genre Midrash* (Staten Island: Society of St Paul, 1967).

Wuellner, W., 'Haggadic Homily Genre in 1 Corinthians 1-3', *JBL* 89 (1970), pp. 199-204.

Yee, G.A., 'A Form-Critical Study of Isaiah 5:1-7 as a Song and as a Juridical Parable', *CBQ* 43 (1981), pp. 30-40.

Yoder, J.H., *The Politics of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972).

Young, B.H., *Jesus and his Jewish Parables* (New York: Paulist Press, 1989).

Young, N.H., 'The Commandment to Love your Neighbor as yourself and the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37)', *AUSS* 21 (1983), pp. 265-72.

—'Once Again, Now, "Who is my Neighbour?"', *EvQ* 49 (1977), pp. 178-79.

Zeitlin, S., 'Hillel and the Hermeneutical Rules', *JQR* 54 (1963), pp. 161-73.

—'Midrash', *JQR* 44 (1953), pp. 21-36.

Zmijewski, J., *Die Eschatologiereden des Lukas-Evangeliums* (Bonn: Hanstein Verlag, 1972).

INDEXES

INDEX OF BIBLICAL REFERENCES

OLD TESTAMENT

Genesis
17.19 75
38.8-10 169
38.8 166, 167, 169, 199
40–41 68

Exodus
1–12 64
3.2 172
3.6 12, 166, 167, 172, 174-77, 199, 202
3.15-16 166, 167
3.15 174
6.4 175
12.1 59
12.4 75
12.16 56, 58
12.43 59
12.48 59
13.8 59
13.13 59
13.14-15 59
13.21 193
14.10 75
15.1 175
16.2-3 92
16.3 91
16.4 75
17.1-7 94
17.11 56
19.2 75
19.4-5 94
19.9 193
19.16 193
20.2-17 64
20.3 142
20.5-6 62
20.12-16 12, 138, 144, 199
20.12 59
20.17 139
20.21 109
20.13 59
21.2-6 28
21.2 59
21.11 56
23.10-12 28
23.23-33 93
28.9-29 161
34.5 193
34.28 91
39.6-14 161

Leviticus
2.34 74
17–26 127
18.5 129, 134
19.3 59
19.18 12, 36, 119, 120, 123, 125, 127, 129, 130, 134, 139, 199, 202
19.34 128
21.1 131
23.40 71
25 103, 109
25.8-55 28
25.13 114
27 109
33.44 75

Numbers
6.26 75
10.34 193
11.25 193
15.31 175
18.28 175
21.28 62
24.17 62
24.24 62

Deuteronomy
1–26 18
3.23 75
5.6-21 64
5.7 142
5.16-20 12, 138, 144, 199
6.4-9 127
6.4-5 36
6.4 119
6.5 12, 81, 82, 119, 123-25, 127, 134, 199
6.7 76, 127
6.10-15 93

6.13 12, 85, 87, 89, 93, 198
6.16 12, 85, 88, 89, 94, 198
8.1-3 92
8.2 91
8.3 12, 85, 86, 89, 91, 92, 198
8.5 91
9.9 91
9.18 91
10.19 128
11.9 175
12.30-31 93
13.1-5 37
15 109
15.1-18 28
15.12 58
15.19 59
21.19-20 76
24.14 139
25.5-10 169
25.5 12, 166, 167, 169, 199
28.1-14 94
31.9-13 28
31.16 175
32.10-11 94
32.32-33 155
38.8 176

Joshua
4.6-21 161
6.5 56
6.26 72

Ruth
3.9–4.12 169

1 Samuel
21.1-6 52

2 Samuel
7.1-17 64
7.12-16 181
7.16 64
12.4 149

1 Kings
2.27 50
13.11-32 130
14.18 156
15.29 156
17.1 114, 116
17.8-16 114, 116
18.1 114, 116
18.13 156
18.31 161
19.5 91
19.8 91
19.10 156
19.14 156
22.27 156

2 Kings
5.1-14 114, 116
9.7 156
9.36 156
10.10 156
14.24 156
17.13 156
17.23 156
21.10 156
24.2 156

1 Chronicles
3.24 193

2 Chronicles
13.22 61
16.10 156
17.14 64
24.21 156
24.27 61
28.8-15 130
35.12 50
36.16 156

Ezra
7.10 61
9.11 156

Nehemiah
9.26 156

Job
19.26 175

Psalms
2.7 88
8.7 180
16.9 175
16.11 175
18.9-12 193
18.10-13 193
31.5 79
36.7-9 94
46.3 192
53.6 140
65.7 192
65.8 192
72.1 140
78 89
80.8-13 155
81.11-13 89
89.9 192
89.20-37 181
90.11-12 87
91 94
91.11-12 12, 85, 93, 94, 97, 198
91.11 88, 94
91.12 87, 88
95.8-9 89
97.2 193
104.3 193
106 81
106.6-8 89
109.1 180
110 184
110.1 12, 79, 178-81, 183, 184, 186, 187, 199, 202
111.9 194
117.1-4 140
117.22 152
117.29 140
118 161
118.22-23 36, 153
118.22 12, 25, 152, 153, 159, 161-63, 199

118.23 153
118.26 79
132.11-12 64
134.3 140
135.1 140

Proverbs
1–9 64
31.10-31 7

Song of Songs
7.9 175

Isaiah
1.27 74
2.3 74
5 147, 154, 155, 163
5.1-7 154, 155, 161, 162
5.1-2 152, 154, 160, 162
5.1 163
5.2 160, 162, 163
5.7 159, 161
5.30 192
6.9 79
8.14-15 152, 159, 161-63
8.14 153, 159
8.22 192
9.2-7 181
9.11 65
9.14-15 55
11.1-9 181
11.1 183, 186
13.4 192
13.6-11 192
13.6-8 192
13.10 192
17.12 192
19.1 193
19.19-22 64
20.3 156
24.19 192
26.19 175
27.2-6 155
28.16 153, 159
33.2 74
34.4 192
40.16 59
42.1 88
42.7 100
42.20 100
44.26 156
50.10 156
51.12 74
52.7 110, 114
52.13–53.12 201
53.12 11, 29, 79
54.11-13 161
54.13 71
56.7 79
58 108
58.5 106
58.6 12, 28, 52, 97, 99, 104-10, 112, 116, 118
58.7 28, 105, 106
61 102, 108, 109
61.1-6 105
61.1-3 103, 112
61.1-2 12, 28, 52, 97, 99, 101, 102, 108-10, 112-18, 199, 202
61.1 99, 100, 104-107, 109, 112
61.2 100, 104, 106, 109, 110, 114, 116
61.6 28, 105
61.7 113
61.9 74
62.2 74
63.4 194
63.10 89

Jeremiah
2.21 155
2.30 156
7.11 79
7.21-22 62
7.22-24 89
7.25 156
23.5-6 181
23.5 183, 186
25.4 156
26.5 156
26.20 156
29.19 156
30.8-9 181
32.18 62
33.14-18 181
35.15 156
37.15 156
44.4 156
48.45 62

Lamentations
1.13 74
4.1-2 161

Ezekiel
1.4-6 193
5.5 55
15.1-6 155
19.10-14 155
20.5-7 89
32.7 192
34 130
34.23-24 181
37.24 181
38.17 156

Daniel
2.34-35 152, 159, 162, 163
2.44-45 159, 161, 162, 163
4.21 55
4.24 55
4.34 194
5.25-26 55
7–12 195, 200
7 196
7.9-13 183
7.13-14 193

7.13 12, 183, 184, 187, 189, 190, 192, 193, 195, 196, 199, 200-202
7.14 190
9.6 156
9.10 156
11.30 62
23.44-45 152
34–35 161

Hosea
6.1 74
6.6-9 130
6.6 130
10.1 155
10.8 11, 79

Joel
1.7 155
2.1 74
2.10 192
2.30-31 192
3.15 192

Amos
3.7 156
5.25-26 62
8.9 192

Jonah
1.15 192

Micah
5.2 181

Habakkuk
2.1-3 68
2.5 71
2.17 56
12.6-10 56

Haggai
2.6 192
2.21 192

Zechariah
1.6 156
1.10 55
1.19 55
3.8-9 160
4.7-10 160
5.3 55
5.6 55
6.12-13 160
9.1–14.21 160
9.9 74
9.16 161
12.10-14 187, 190
12.10 192

Malachi
3.1 79

NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew
3.9 161
4.1-11 80
4.4 86
4.5 81
4.6 87, 88
4.7 88
4.8 84
4.10 82, 87
4.11 95
5.3-12 113
5.3-4 97
5.17-20 45
5.43 128
10.23 190
11.5 97
12.3 52
12.5 52
13.41 190
15.1-20 144
16.28 190
19.3-9 134
19.4 52
19.16-30 135
19.18-19 138
19.22 142
19.28 190
19.29 143
19.30 144
21.16 52
21.33-46 116, 147
21.33-44 163
21.33 154, 163
21.35 163
21.41 157
21.42 52, 152, 153, 160, 163
21.43 155
21.44 147, 163
22.12 181
22.23-33 164
22.24 166
22.29 165, 170
22.31 52
22.32 167
22.34-40 119-21, 153
22.36 125, 126, 140
22.37-39 123, 129, 141
22.37 124, 199
22.39 125
22.41-46 178
22.44 179
22.46 165, 180
23.24 143
23.31 156
23.39 85
24.27 190
24.29-31 187
24.29 192
24.30 187, 189
24.31 193
24.37 190
24.39 190

24.44 190
25.31 190

Mark
1.12-13 80
1.13 95
1.15 112
2.25 52
6 28
6.1-6 98
7.1-23 144
8.10 161
8.38 189, 190
9.12 161
9.31 161
10.17-31 135, 136
10.17-22 136
10.17 137, 139
10.19 138
10.21 137
10.22 142
10.23-27 136
10.23 136, 137
10.24 137
10.25 136, 137
10.26-28 137
10.28-31 136
10.29-30 137
10.30 143
10.31 136, 137, 144
10.33 161
12.1-12 147
12.1 154, 163
12.10-11 36, 152, 154, 159
12.10 52, 134, 153, 160, 163
12.18-27 164
12.19 166
12.24-25 165
12.24 165, 170
12.26-27 165
12.26 52, 134, 167
12.28-34 36, 119-21, 123, 153
12.28-31 119
12.28 126, 140, 175
12.29-31 123, 134, 141, 199
12.29 119
12.30-31 129
12.30 124, 125
12.31 125
12.32 175
12.34 165, 175
12.35-37 177
12.35 134, 181
12.36 179
13.24-27 187
13.24-25 192
13.26 189, 190
13.27 193
14.62 189, 190
17.22 136
18.23-27 136
18.28-30 136

Luke
1–2 17, 18, 20, 24
1 27
1.6 141
1.13-17 26
1.15 47
1.20 54
1.35 102
1.67-69 26
2.22 53
2.23-24 26
2.23 48, 52, 54, 55
2.24 48, 52, 55, 128
2.25 102
2.27 53
2.39 53
2.40 54
2.41-48 11
3.4-6 48
3.4 48, 52, 55
3.5 54
3.8 161
3.16 97
3.21-22 88, 101
3.22 102
3.23-38 88, 101
4.1-13 12, 79, 80, 84, 88, 95, 96, 201
4.1-2 90
4.1 89, 97, 102
4.3-12 91
4.3-4 91
4.3 91
4.4 48, 52, 55, 86, 94, 198, 199
4.5-8 92
4.5 84
4.7 87
4.8 48, 52, 55, 87, 94, 198, 199
4.9-12 93
4.9 81, 91, 93
4.10-11 48, 87, 97, 198
4.10 48, 52, 55, 88, 94, 199
4.12 48, 52, 54, 88, 198, 199
4.13 94
4.14-32 24
4.14-22 112
4.14-15 101
4.14 102
4.15 101
4.16-30 11, 12, 20, 26, 28, 29, 33, 61, 79, 98, 101, 200, 201, 203
4.16-27 101, 118
4.16-22 98
4.16-21 45
4.16 52, 101, 199
4.17-27 116, 133
4.17-22 102
4.17-19 99
4.17 48, 52, 199

4.18-19 17, 28, 29, 48, 99, 102, 106, 108-10, 113, 118, 198-200, 202
4.18 100, 102, 104, 107, 110, 117
4.19 100, 110, 114, 117, 118
4.20-24 116
4.21 52, 53, 54, 112-14, 118, 197, 199, 113
4.22 99, 114, 115, 118
4.23-30 98
4.23-27 99, 114
4.23-24 114
4.23 99, 115, 118
4.24 111, 114, 117, 118
4.25-27 28, 112, 115, 116
4.25 28
4.28-30 98, 113, 114, 118
4.28-29 115
4.31-44 101
4.37-41 112
5.1-11 20
5.25 128
6.1-5 22, 23, 133, 176
6.3 52, 53, 127
6.20-38 29
6.20-23 113
6.20 97, 104
6.39 104
7.1 54
7.11-17 20, 26, 115
7.18-33 24
7.21-22 104
7.21 104
7.22 47, 97, 104
7.27 48, 52, 55, 79
8.9-10 22
8.10 47, 48, 52, 79
8.12 95
8.23 54
8.31 53
9–10 200
9.10-17 92
9.18-22 24
9.22 26
9.31 54
9.34-35 193
9.51-62 20
9.51 54
9.52-55 115
9.54 47
9.61-62 115
10.1–18.14 18
10.7-9 28
10.17-18 95
10.25-37 12, 23, 79, 119, 123, 125, 133, 134, 141, 144, 153, 176, 185, 200-203
10.25-28 119-22, 125, 135, 153, 164
10.25-27 126, 134
10.25 129
10.26 48, 52, 54, 141, 199
10.27 25, 48, 123, 124, 129, 134, 198, 199
10.29-37 20, 119, 121, 122, 125, 129, 135
10.29-36 134
10.29-30 123
10.29 121-23, 132, 134
10.30-35 128, 130, 200
10.36-37 121, 123
10.36 121, 134
10.37 134
11.2-4 29
11.14-22 95
11.22 28, 97
11.31-32 184
11.49 53
12.8 190
12.35-48 187
12.35 47
12.37 114
12.40 190
12.53 47
13.11-17 95
13.17 114
13.19 47
13.27 47
13.30 144
13.35 48, 79, 85
14.13 104
14.14 168
14.15-24 28
14.21 104
15–18 153
15.11-32 20
16.1-8 20
16.16-17 45
16.16 53
16.17 53
16.20 104
16.22 104
16.29 53
16.31 53
17.20-37 191
17.22-37 187
17.22 190
17.24 190
17.26 190
17.30 190
18.8 190
18.11 141
18.18-30 12, 79, 126, 135-37, 139, 144, 145, 185,

	200, 201, 203	20.10-12	153, 155	20.39	175, 181, 197
		20.13-15	153, 155, 156	20.40	119, 120, 165, 175, 181
18.18-27	144				
18.18-23	136, 139, 140	20.15-18	154, 157		
		20.15	147, 157, 163	20.41-44	12, 79, 147, 177, 180, 185, 186, 200-202
18.18-20	144				
18.18	126, 144	20.16	147, 157, 163		
18.19-23	145				
18.20	48, 52, 138, 198, 199, 202	20.17-19	157		
		20.17-18	157, 159, 163, 199	20.41-43	182
				20.41	181, 186
18.21-30	144	20.17	25, 48, 52, 53, 54, 152, 159, 163, 172, 175, 198, 199	20.42-43	48, 179, 181, 186, 198, 199
18.22	104, 141				
18.23	145				
18.24-30	136, 140, 142			20.42	48, 52, 53, 54, 199
18.24-26	145	20.18	147, 154, 159, 163	20.44	182, 186
18.25	145			21.1-4	153
18.27-30	145	20.19	154, 155, 157, 161	21.3	104
18.27	142			21.5-38	153
18.29-30	114	20.20-47	153	21.5-36	191, 195, 200
18.29	144	20.23	52		
18.30	171	20.27-40	12, 79, 133, 147, 164, 167, 176, 185, 200, 201	21.5-7	191
18.31	54			21.7	191
18.35	104			21.8-11	191
19.1-10	20			21.11	191
19.8	104			21.12-19	191
19.20	144	20.27-33	164, 168	21.20-24	191
19.38	48	20.27-28	176	21.22	53, 54
19.39-40	161	20.28	48, 52, 166, 198, 199	21.24	54
19.45–21.38	147, 153			21.25-28	12, 79, 147, 187-89, 191, 195, 199-201
19.46	48, 52, 55, 79	20.34-38	164, 168, 170		
20.1-9	153	20.34-36	170, 171		
20.1-8	154	20.34-35	165	21.25-26	187, 191-93
20.9-19	12, 23, 79, 116, 132, 147, 152, 153, 177, 185, 200-203	20.34	170, 171	21.25	187, 192
		20.35	171	21.26	47, 187, 192, 193
		20.36	165		
		20.37-39	165	21.27	48, 187, 189-92, 198, 199, 200, 202
		20.37-38	170, 175, 199, 200, 202		
20.9-18	153, 162, 163, 200	20.37	48, 52, 167, 198, 199	21.28	187, 191, 193, 194
20.9-17	134				
20.9-16	155	20.38	165, 198, 199	21.29-33	191
20.9	153, 154, 163	20.39-40	164, 168, 175	21.32	114
				21.34-36	191
20.10-16	163			21.34-35	191

21.36 190
22–23 29
22.3 94
22.16 54
22.28 95
22.30 190
22.31-32 83
22.35-37 28
22.37 11, 17, 29, 48, 52-54, 79
22.69 48, 79, 179, 183, 184, 186
23.13 140
23.30 11, 48, 79
23.34 47
23.35 140
23.43 114
23.46 11, 48, 79
24 23-25, 53
24.1-53 24
24.6-8 24
24.13-49 11, 53
24.20 140
24.25 53
24.27 53
24.28-49 26
24.32 53
24.44-47 23
24.44 24, 53, 54
24.45 53
24.46 53
24.47 16
26.18 104
28–36 24
29–33 176
34–38 176
37–43 24
51 24
54.18-19 102

John
4.9 132
5.46 135
6.31-58 75
7.1-7 94
7.1-3 94
7.49 128
15.1-5 155
19.37 192

Acts
1.9-11 189
1.9 193
1.11 192, 193
1.20 180
2.17-21 26
2.22-36 26
2.25-36 184
2.34-36 178, 186
2.34-35 179, 202
2.34 178
3.13-26 24
3.13 167, 172
3.26 27
4.11 25, 153, 159, 164, 202
4.27 97, 102, 202
5.31 178
7 26
7.32 167
7.52 156
7.55 179
8.23 97
10.36 27
10.38 97, 102, 114, 202
10.42-43 178
13 27
13.5 101
13.14 101
13.15-17 101
13.32-35 26
13.33 180
13.47 25
14.1 101
16.13 101
17.2 101
17.10 101
18.4 101
18.26 101
19.8 101
22.3 61
28.17-31 24

Romans
1.3-4 178
4.1-22 75
8.23 194
8.29 165
8.34 179
9.32-33 159, 164, 202
13.9 125, 138, 139, 202

1 Corinthians
3.9 159
10.1-13 89
10.6-9 81
15.12-14 165
15.49 165

2 Corinthians
2.4 192

Galatians
3.6-29 75
5.14 125, 202

Ephesians
1.14 194
1.20 179
2.19-22 159
2.20 164, 202
4.30 194
6.2 138, 202

Philippians
3.6 141
3.21 165

Colossians
3.1 179

1 Thessalonians
2.15 156
4.17 189, 193

Hebrews
1.3 179
1.9 102
1.13 180, 202

2.8 180
3.16-18 89
8.1 179
10.12 179
11.16 172
11.36-38 156
12.2 179

James
2.8 125, 202
2.11 138, 139, 202

1 Peter
2.4-8 164, 202
2.6-8 153, 159
2.7 153
3.22 179

Jude
5 89

Revelation
1.7 189, 190, 192, 202
1.13 189, 202
3.20 42
5.10 97
6.12-16 192
14.14 190, 202
16.15 42

INDEX OF AUTHORS

Albertz, R. 104
Alexander, P.S. 21, 62, 65, 162
Allison, D.C. 92
Amir, Y. 50
Anderson, H. 97, 105
Archer, G.L. 13, 47, 85, 167
Argyle, A.W. 107
Atkinson, B.F.C. 85
Aune, D.E. 43, 110

Baarlink, H. 110
Bacher, W. 55, 73, 74
Bailey, K.E. 122, 126, 131, 132, 136, 139, 143
Bammel, E. 151
Barrett, C.K. 16, 17, 47, 82, 85, 91, 92, 95, 98, 111
Baumbach, G. 168
Beasley-Murray, G.R. 187, 188, 192-94
Best, E. 89, 136
Betz, O. 31, 70, 110, 160
Billerbeck, P. 102
Binder, H. 121, 133
Bishop, E.F.F. 130
Black, M. 18, 70, 108, 149, 150, 160
Blake, B. 141
Blank, J. 131, 155
Bligh, J. 19
Bloch, R. 62, 63, 65
Blomberg, C.L. 19, 22, 32, 35, 39, 41, 84, 120, 122, 123, 126, 129, 130, 132, 133, 149-51, 155, 158, 159, 162, 191
Bock, D.L. 14, 16, 20, 22, 26, 27, 85, 100, 106, 112, 115, 155, 159, 163, 179, 183, 185-87, 193-95
Borg, M.J. 32
Borgen, P. 73-76
Boring, E.M. 42
Bornkamm, G. 120, 159
Borsch, F.H. 188
Bovon, F. 14, 16, 31
Bowker, J.W. 45, 58, 72-75, 102
Bowman, J. 128
Branick, V.P. 75
Braude, W.G. 73
Brawley, R.L. 115
Brooke, G.J. 65, 70, 71
Brown, R.E. 20, 149
Brown, S. 33, 85, 95
Brownlee, W.H. 65, 66, 70, 71
Bruce, F.F. 65, 69, 70, 159
Bultmann, R. 31, 33-36, 42, 82, 84, 95, 98, 110, 120, 121, 136, 137, 148, 165, 178, 182, 188
Burger, C. 181, 182, 184
Burkitt, F.C. 151
Burney, C.F. 41
Burrell, D.J. 30
Burrows, M. 51, 169
Butts, J.R. 32
Büchsel, F. 194

Cadbury, H.J. 23
Caird, G.B. 43, 82, 92, 158, 169-71, 174, 188, 193
Calvert, D.G.A. 35
Cappel, L. 13
Carlston, C.E. 148
Carrington, P. 20, 160
Carson, D.A. 35, 64, 81
Casey, M. 189, 193, 196
Catchpole, D.R. 35

Cave, C.H. 108, 109, 113, 130, 150
Cerfaux, L. 15
Charlesworth, J.H. 32
Chilton, B. 30, 109, 162, 183
Chirichigno, G. 13
Clapton, E. 30
Clarke, W.K.L. 15, 28
Cohn-Sherbok, D.M. 174
Collins, J.J. 69
Colpe, C. 188
Combrink, H.J.B. 105
Conzelmann, H. 23, 24, 94, 95
Coulot, C. 136
Craigie, P.C. 127
Cranfield, C.E.B. 121, 133, 137, 140, 142, 178
Creed, J.M. 82, 84, 98, 120, 121, 161, 169, 188
Crockett, L.C. 28, 102, 105, 106, 115
Crossan, J.D. 32, 121, 122, 150, 152
Cullmann, O. 40, 178, 183

Dahl, N.A. 23, 25
Dana, H.E. 30
Daube, D. 52, 56, 57, 116, 126, 127, 144, 145, 153, 169, 175, 181, 183
Davids, P.H. 40, 41
Davidson, R. 89
Davies, W.D. 40, 92
Dehandschutter, B. 151
Delling, G. 53
Derrett, J.D.M. 19, 115, 123, 126-28, 130-32, 149-51, 159, 161
Deutsch, G. 169
Dibelius, M. 31
Dietrich, W. 104
Diezinger, W. 129
Dittmar, W. 13, 47
Doble, P. 91
Dodd, C.H. 13, 105, 132, 148-52, 159, 160, 179, 186, 189, 201
Doeve, J.W. 13, 22, 23, 32, 34, 40, 45, 57, 58, 60, 62, 63, 78, 86, 160, 174, 197
Downing, F.G. 174
Dreyfus, F. 172
Drury, J. 18-22, 149
Drusius, J. 13

Dunn, J.D.G. 43, 190, 193
Dupont, J. 23, 80, 83, 89

Edgar, S.L. 96
Ehrhardt, A. 25
Elliger, K. 70
Ellis, E.E. 13, 15, 18, 21-23, 30, 32, 33, 37-42, 45, 49, 50, 52, 55, 56, 58, 59, 61-65, 69, 71, 73-76, 78, 80, 81, 84, 89-92, 94, 96, 98, 102, 104, 107, 109, 110, 112, 116, 117, 119, 120, 123, 125-27, 129, 133, 134, 136, 137, 140, 142-44, 148, 150, 151, 153, 154, 156-63, 165, 167-72, 174-76, 180, 184, 185, 188, 191, 193, 195, 197, 200, 202
Eltester, W. 98, 104, 120
Evans, C.F. 14, 18-21, 33, 81, 82, 89, 91, 94, 98, 105, 110, 115, 120, 121, 137, 141-43, 149, 158, 166, 171-75, 177, 181, 182, 188, 190
Evans, C.A. 36, 37, 45, 61, 90, 115, 130, 154, 162

Feuillet, A. 89
Finch, R.G. 20
Finkel, A. 68, 70, 71, 73, 75, 101, 111, 113, 116, 129, 160
Fishbane, M. 64, 66, 69, 70
Fitzmyer, J.A. 17, 51, 54, 69, 80, 81, 83-85, 89, 90, 92, 95, 97, 98, 101-103, 106, 108, 110-13, 120, 121, 124-27, 129, 130, 132, 135, 137, 139-43, 147, 148, 152, 154-59, 164-66, 168, 169, 171-74, 177-85, 187, 188, 191, 193
Flamming, J. 97
Flender, H. 126
Flichtner, J. 128
Flusser, D. 95, 150, 157
Foerster, W. 91
Fox, M.V. 50
France, R.T. 21, 31, 32, 35, 42, 83, 85, 86, 89-91, 99, 100, 104, 108, 112, 113, 115, 124, 138, 159, 163, 182, 183, 190, 193, 196, 197
Franklin, E. 23-25, 111

Freed, E. 14
Fridrichsen, A. 82
Friebel, K.G. 66
Fuchs, E. 113
Fuller, R.H. 34, 36
Funk, R.W. 32, 121, 130
Furness, J.M. 130
Furnish, V.P. 120, 121

Gagg, R.P. 177, 179
Gaston, L. 188
Geiger, R. 188
Geldenhuys, N. 84, 89, 91, 93, 97, 105, 113, 120, 129, 130, 140, 142, 143, 158, 173, 185
Gerhardsson, B. 40, 41, 82, 89-92, 123, 129, 130
Gertner, M. 61-63, 105
Gibson, E.C.S. 30
Gilbert, G.H. 30
Glasson, T.F. 192
Glendenning, F.J. 95
Goetz, S.C. 39
Goldberg, A. 73
Goldingay, J.E. 193
Gooding, D.W. 65
Goppelt, L. 89
Gordis, R. 50
Goulder, M.D. 18, 19, 21, 102, 126
Grant, W.M. 30
Gray, A. 156, 157
Green, J.B. 14
Greeven, H. 93, 128
Grimm, W. 31
Grundmann, W. 17, 126, 135, 141, 171, 183, 193
Guelich, R. 43
Guilding, A. 20, 73, 102
Gundry, R.H. 14, 32, 41, 85, 87, 88, 107, 124, 125, 139, 173, 174, 180, 190, 191, 194

Haenchen, E. 15
Hahn, F. 111, 178, 179, 183
Halévy, J. 131
Hanford, W.R. 97
Harris, M. 171
Hartman, L. 75, 188, 192, 195
Harvey, A.E. 32
Hauck, F. 37, 140, 149
Haupt, E. 13
Hawkins, J.C. 17
Hawthorne, G.F. 35, 42, 160
Hay, D.M. 179, 183, 185, 186
Heinemann, J. 73, 74, 102
Hengel, M. 41, 57, 142, 151
Higgins, A.J.B. 152, 189
Hill, D. 42, 43, 97, 111
Holst, R. 91
Holtz, T. 14-16, 47, 85-88, 125, 153, 166, 179, 180, 190
Hooker, M.D. 35, 105, 188, 195
Horgan, M.P. 65
Horsley, R.A. 32
Horton, F.L., Jr 18, 30, 51, 108
Hughes, P.E. 108
Hultgren, A.J. 120
Hurst, L.D. 134
Hydahl, N. 94

Janzen, J.G. 172
Jeremias, J. 83, 84, 92, 95, 110, 121, 122, 126, 128, 130, 132, 133, 143, 148-52, 154-56, 158, 159, 161, 165, 168, 183, 197
Johnson, F. 13, 84, 93, 103, 111, 125, 140, 154, 159, 161, 171, 184
Jones, P.R. 123
Jonge, M. de 103
Jülicher, A. 133, 148

Kähler, M. 30
Kaiser, W.C., Jr 78
Kapstein, I.J. 32, 73
Kasch, W. 140
Käsemann, E. 35
Kasher, R. 58, 77
Kermode, F. 76
Kilgallen, J.J. 164, 167, 171
Kim, S. 160
Kirby, V.T. 15
Kirk, J.A. 84, 89
Kittel, G. 91
Klein, W.W. 112
Koet, B.J. 53, 106, 111, 115
Köster, H. 32, 192

Kuhn, K.G. 95
Kümmel, W.G. 149, 151

Lambrecht, J. 120, 121
Larkin, W.J., Jr 14, 28, 29, 45
Laurentin, R. 20
Le Déaut, R. 61, 65, 162
Légasse, S. 136
Le Moyne, J. 168
Leaney, A.R.C. 91, 98, 115, 154, 161, 174
Léon-Dufour, X. 148
Lieberman, S. 57
Lightfoot, J. 160
Lim, T.H. 71
Lindars, B. 124, 149, 178, 189
Linnemann, E. 120, 121
Loader, W.R.G. 178
Loewe, R. 77
Lohse, E. 24, 37, 181, 183
Longenecker, R.N. 13, 22, 23, 35, 45, 47, 52, 57, 58, 60, 66, 69-71, 76-78, 86, 96, 108, 109, 112, 124, 134, 160, 163, 168, 174, 180, 185, 201, 202
Lövestam, E. 179
Lowe, M. 157
Lowy, S. 77
Lund, N.W. 105

McEleney, N.J. 35
MacFarland, C.S. 30
McKelvey, R.J. 159
McKnight, E.V. 14, 31
McNamara, M. 61, 62
McNeil, B. 20, 30
McNeile, A.H. 30
Mann, J. 73, 74, 75, 116, 131
Manns, F. 144, 174
Manson, T. 30, 81, 83, 84, 90, 92, 94, 120-22, 125, 126, 129, 130, 134, 153, 159, 168
Marshall, I.H. 42, 43, 53, 80, 81, 83-86, 88, 89, 91-95, 97, 98, 100-102, 104, 105, 110, 111, 120-22, 124-33, 136, 137, 139-43, 148, 153, 154, 156, 158, 159, 165, 169-75, 177-79, 181-85, 187-89, 191-94
Masson, W.J. 98, 131
Mattill, A.J., Jr 131
Mauser, U. 90, 91
Maybaum, S. 73, 74
Mead, R.T. 96
Mealand, D.L. 35
Meeks, W.A. 75
Meier, J.P. 32
Meinhold, J. 30
Metzger, B.M. 50, 54, 86, 113
Meyer, R. 32
Michel, O. 143
Milavec, A. 156
Miller, M.P. 61, 103, 106
Minear, P.S. 136
Moessner, D.P. 19
Monselewski, W. 133
Monshouwer, D. 109
Montefiore, H. 152
Moo, D.J. 45, 71, 86, 108
Moore, G.F. 58, 60, 175
Moran, W.L. 127
Morgan, G.C. 30
Morris, L. 17, 22, 80, 102
Moule, C.F.D. 20, 54
Müller, K. 168
Murray, G. 141
Murray, V.A. 85

Neill, S. 33
Neugebauer, F. 43, 183
Neusner, J. 62, 103
Newell, R.R. 157
Nicol, W. 188
Nierynck, F. 165, 188
Nolland, J. 81, 83, 84, 92-95, 98, 104, 111, 113

Odeberg, H. 173
Oepke, A. 30, 175
Oliver, H.H. 26
O'Neill, J.C. 114, 156
Orchard, J.B. 148
Osborne, G.R. 81
Owen, H. 13

Patte, D. 45
Perrin, N. 33-35, 42, 120, 136, 178, 189
Perrot, C. 101, 102
Peters, J.P. 30
Plummer, A. 81, 83, 84, 90, 98, 105, 120, 126, 127, 130, 140-42, 155, 169, 174, 194
Pokorny, P. 88
Polkow, D. 35
Porton, G.G. 62
Powell, W. 93

Rabinowitz, I. 70
Ramaroson, L. 122
Randolph, T. 13
Reicke, B. 101, 108, 133
Reim, G. 14
Rengstorf, K.H. 37, 131, 192
Rese, M. 14, 16, 26, 27, 85, 105, 163, 180
Riesenfeld, H. 40, 84
Riesner, R. 40, 41
Ringe, S.H. 103
Ringgren, H. 16, 47, 85, 105
Robert, A. 62
Robinson, J.A.T. 89, 148
Rodgers, M. 104
Roth, C. 70
Ryle, H.E. 50

Sabourin, L. 193
Saldarini, A.J. 78
Sanders, E.P. 32, 135
Sanders, J.A. 97, 103, 107, 109, 111-15, 118
Sanders, J.T. 19, 23, 25
Sanders, W.E. 30
Sanderson, M.L. 21
Schlatter, A. 105
Schmeichel, W. 115
Schmidt, K.L. 31
Schneider, G. 178, 182, 183
Schoedel, W.R. 151
Schramm, T. 80, 98, 120, 135, 148, 152, 165, 177, 188
Schubert, P. 25, 26
Schürer, E. 101
Schürmann, H. 41, 81, 86, 92, 98, 101, 152
Schwankl, O. 165, 168
Schweizer, E. 93, 102, 115, 122, 158
Scott, B.B. 32, 121, 131, 149, 154
Scroggs, R. 76
Seccombe, D. 97, 98, 106, 142
Seesemann, H. 84
Seitz, O.J.F. 189
Sellin, G. 120, 121
Sevenster, J.N. 32, 107
Sheppard, G.T. 154
Sigal, P. 31
Silberman, L.H. 70
Silva, M. 85
Sloan, R.B. 28, 29, 103, 104, 106, 108-12
Slomovic, E. 70
Smalley, S.S. 81
Smith, M.H. 32, 40, 75
Snodgrass, K.R. 147-52, 154-61
Sparks, H.F.D. 17
Spencer, F.S. 130, 133
Spitta, F. 141
Stanton, G. 17, 35, 41
Stegner, W.R. 32, 76, 82, 90
Stein, E 73
Stein, R.H. 32, 36, 39-41, 80, 83, 84, 94, 95, 140, 142, 151, 158, 159, 169
Stendahl, K. 14, 71, 85-87, 95, 98, 108, 124, 139, 153, 166, 180, 186, 190
Stern, J.B. 128
Strack, H.L. 58
Strauss, D.F. 82
Strobel, A. 104
Stuhlmacher, P. 32, 39, 40
Suhl, A. 14, 182
Surenhusius, W. 13
Swanston, H. 81
Swete, H.B. 13, 30, 47

Talbert, C.H. 23, 26, 80, 85, 89, 126, 142, 143, 153, 158, 169, 173, 182
Tannehill, R.C. 98, 111
Tasker, R.V.G. 30
Taylor, A.B., Jr 89
Taylor, V. 34, 178

Thomas, K.J. 124, 137, 139, 149
Thompson, G.H.P. 89, 90
Thomson, J.G.S.S. 30
Tilden, E.E., Jr 30
Tödt, H.E. 189
Tov, E. 65
Towner, W.S. 57, 58, 78
Toy, C.H. 13, 47
Travis, S.H. 31
Trocmé, A. 103
Trudinger, L.P. 122
Tuckett, C.M. 21, 98, 109, 152
Turner, H.E.W. 18, 35, 108
Turpie, D.M. 13, 47, 49
Twelftree, G.H. 84, 89, 91, 94

Van Elderen, B. 122, 126
Van Unnik, W.C. 102
Venard, L. 47
Vermes, G. 32, 62, 63, 65, 68, 101
Via, D.O., Jr 150
Vincent, J.J. 40
Violet, B. 110
Vouga, F. 165

Wagner, W. 141
Walker, W.O. 35, 103
Walter, N. 136
Warfield, B.B. 141
Watts, J.D.W. 103, 104, 109
Weiss, J. 135
Wenham, J.W. 30, 80, 141, 187, 188, 191, 192
Westermann, C. 103, 109
Wilcox, M. 15, 85
Wiles, M. 171
Wilkinson, F.H. 130
Williamson, H.G.M. 64
Willis, J.T. 154
Wise, W.O. 108
Wright, T. 33, 62
Wuellner, W. 76

Yee, G.A. 154
Yoder, J.H. 103
Young, N.H. 122, 127, 150, 158

Zeitlin, S. 57, 61, 62
Zmijewski, J. 188